ANYOKTISTABAKA

Vaṁsīdhara Mis'ra

BY

J. T. Parikh, M. A.

AND

R. G. Asti, M. A.

Sanskrit Department, M. T. B. College, Surat

1955

Chunilal Gandhi Vidyabhavan,

Institute of Learning and Research, Surat.

Published by

J. T. PARIKH, M. A.

Secretary,

Chunilal Gandhi Vidyabhavan,

Sarvajanik Education Society, Surat.

Printed by

H. P. CROMIE,

Mission Press, Surat.

Rupees Two

PREFACE

The *Anyoktistabaka* of Vaṁsīdhara Mis'ra is a collection of about one hundred stanzas popularly known as *anyāpades'a* or *anyokti*. The Ms. of the work, on which the present edition is based, bears Saṁvat 1727 as the year of its copying. The actual date of its composition may be much earlier. The desire of the Chunilal Gandhi Vidyabhavan to publish the work has given us an opportunity to prefix to the edition an introduction dealing with the history of Anyokti in Sanskrit Poetics. In the preparation of the introduction we have consulted a good number of well-known works on Sanskrit Poetics. We are thankful to the authorities of the Vidyabhavan for giving us this opportunity.

20-5-55
M. T. B. College,
SURAT.

J. T. PARIKH
R. G. ASTI

INTRODUCTION

I. The History of Anyokti in Sanskrit Poetics

Every student of Sanskrit literature is familiar with the well-known speech of Priyaṁvadā and Anasūyā, viz.

चक्रवाकवधुके आमन्त्रयस्व सहचरम् । उपस्थिता रजनी ।

S'ākuntala III. 23. 1.

In the Latāmaṇḍapa, surrounded by Vetasa plants, on the bank of the river Mālinī, Duṣyanta is making love to S'akuntalā. Anasūyā and Priyaṁvadā are loitering outside keeping watch all around. On seeing Gautamī arriving on the scene they warn the lovers inside the bower by uttering the above speech. Here is a charming Anyāpades'a. An equally charming Anyokti is given by Kālidāsa in that famous song of Haṁsapadikā :

अभिनवमधुलोलुपस्त्वं तथा परिचुम्ब्य चूतमञ्जरीम् ।
कमलवसतिमात्रनिर्वृतो मधुकर विस्मृतोऽस्येनां कथम् ॥

S'ākuntala V. 1.

Explaining the hidden meaning of this song to his friend Mādhavya, Duṣyanta remarks :

सकृत्कृतप्रणयोऽयं जनः । तदस्या देवीं वसुमतीमन्तरेण मदुपालम्भमवगतोऽस्मि । सखे माधव्य मद्वचनादुच्यतां हंसपदिका । निपुणमुपालब्धाः स्म इति ।

S'ākuntala V. 1.3.

Kālidāsa has hit the nail in giving the real purpose of Anyokti by telling us that it is an *upālambha*, indeed a *nipuṇa ūpālambha*.

Anyokti, also called Anyāpades'a by some, is apparently an address to a bird, to an animal, to a tree or to an object like the moon, the sun, the cloud, the lake, the ocean etc. But really it is intended as a rebuke directed against some person, some character. In its more extended meaning Anyokti is a criticism of life. It is a veiled criticism, a hidden sarcasm, an indirect praise or ridicule of the varied facets of human character. The bitter experiences of worldly life find a carping expression, a pointed reference in these indirect censure and praise of natural objects, whose behaviour and character bear a close resemblance to those of human beings. " The flaws and failings of men, their nobility and meaness" are the targets which the poets of Anyokti literature have invariably aimed at with their bitingly poignant remarks.

Bharata

Bharata does not deal with this figure since his Nāṭyas'āstra treats of only four figures, viz. Anuprāsa, Yamaka, Upamā and Rūpaka. But in the chapter on metres he enumerates and defines the thirty-six Lakṣaṇas, which he calls " beautifying factors of Poetry"; cf. एतानि वा काव्यविभूषणानि । and प्रोक्तानि वै भूषणसंमितानि । In Bharata the Lakṣaṇas have been dealt with separately from the Alaṁkāras though no attempt is made to distinguish between the two. In this connection Dr. Raghavan remarks, " Many of these later Alaṁkāras have their counterpart in Lakṣaṇas. The Lakṣaṇas had developed separately as adorning features, independently of Alaṁkāras."[1]

Among these Lakṣaṇas Bharata gives one called *Manoratha* which he defines as:

---

1 *Some Concepts of the Alaṁkāra S'āstra.* P. 40.

हृदयार्थ(यस्थ)स्य वाक्यस्य गूढार्थस्य विभावकम् ।
अन्यापदेशैः कथनं मनोरथ इति स्मृतः ॥

Nāṭyas'āstra XVI. 36.

Though Bharata does not give any illustration it is clear from the definition that his *manoratha* is the same as '*anyāpades'a.*' Says Dr. Raghavan, "The Lakṣaṇa called 'manoratha' has in its definition the word 'anyāpades'a' and is actually the 'anyāpades'a' of later literature, i. e. Anyokti." [2]

Being a striking form of Vakrokti, which, according to Bhāmaha's dictum सैषा सर्वत्र वक्रोक्तिरनयार्थो विभाव्यते ।, is the basis of all alaṁkāra in poetry, Anyokti was recognised quite early as a figure of sense though under a different name, Aprastutapras'aṁsā.

Daṇḍin

Daṇḍin deals with this figure after Virodhālaṁkāra in the second Pariccheda of his *Kāvyādars'a.* His definition of the figure is :

अप्रस्तुतप्रशंसा स्यादप्रक्रान्तेषु या स्तुतिः ।

Kāvyādars'a II. 340. cd.

Aprastutapras'aṁsā is the praise of what is not prakrānta, i.e. of an object other than the one under discussion, of that which does not form the theme. Raṅgācārya Raddi Shastri explains this definition in his commentary *Prabhā* as follows :—

---

2 *For a distinction between Anyāpades'a and Anyokti see the section on Bhoja.*

अप्रक्रान्तेषु षष्ठ्यर्थ सप्तमी। अप्रस्तुतानामित्यर्थः। या स्तुतिः प्रस्तुतस्य निन्दार्थमिति शेषः। सा अप्रस्तुतप्रशंसा।... ...अप्रस्तुतप्रशंसया प्रस्तुतस्य निन्दा।

Prabhā on *Kāvyādars'a* 340.

That this is the meaning intended by Daṇḍin himself is borne out by the illustration that he has given, viz.

सुखं जीवन्ति हरिणा वनेष्वपरसेविनः।
अन्नैरयत्नसुलभैस्तृणदर्भाङ्कुरादिभिः॥

Kāvyādars'a 341.

The applicability, saṁgati, of the illustration is shown in the next Kārikā :—

सेयमप्रस्तुतैवात्र मृगवृत्तिः प्रशस्यते।
राजानुवर्तनक्लेशनिर्विण्णेन मनस्विना॥

Kāvyādārs'a 342.

Daṇḍin's conception of the figure is very clear. The theme of the poet is to censure something, some object, some idea. But instead of doing that directly he suggests it by praising what does not form his theme and what is exactly the opposite of the thing intended to be condemned. This is the only type of Aprastutapras'aṁsā admitted by Daṇḍin. Unlike later rhetoricians he does not admit five varieties, the last of which is termed Anyokti.

However Daṇḍin's Aprastutapras'aṁsā can be regarded as the normal fifth variety of the Vaidharmya type. The *Alaṁkārasarvasva* admits two types of the fifth variety which is based on Sārūpya:

तत्रापि सारूप्यहेतुके भेदे साधर्म्यवैधर्म्याभ्यां द्वैविध्यम्।

Alaṁkārasarvasva P. 133.

The *Alaṁkārasarvasva* illustrates the Vaidharmya type by the stanza :-

धन्याः खलु वने वाताः कह्लारस्पर्शशीतलाः ।
राममिन्दीवरश्यामं ये स्पृशन्त्यनिवारिताः ॥

Alaṁkārasarvasva P. 137.

This is the speech of Das'aratha lamenting over the banishment of Rāma :

अत्र वाता धन्या इति अप्रस्तुतादर्थादहमधन्य इति वैधर्म्येण प्रस्तुतोऽर्थः प्रतीयते ।

Alaṁkārasarvasva P. 137.

Even so the stanza given by Daṇḍin as an illustration can be looked upon as an instance of the Sārūpyamūlā Aprastutapras'aṁsā of the Vaidharmya type. Following the explanation of Daṇḍin himself we might say :

अत्र मृगवृत्तिः प्रशस्ता इति अप्रस्तुतादर्थाद् राजसेवकवृत्ति-र्निन्दिता इति वैधर्म्येण प्रस्तुतोऽर्थः प्रतीयते ।

Bhāmaha

Bhāmaha (about 700-750 A.D.) gives the following as the definition of the figure :

अधिकारादपेतस्य वस्तुनोऽन्यस्य या स्तुतिः ।
अप्रस्तुतप्रशंसेति सा चैवं कथ्यते यथा ॥

Bhā. Kāvyālaṁkāra III. 28.

Aprastutapras'aṁsā is the praise of another thing, i.e. the one that is not the theme.

Like Daṇḍin Bhāmaha admits only one type of this alaṁkāra. But unlike the former he does not explain how his definition is applicable to the illsutration provided by

him. It is, therefore, difficult to ascertain the precise nature of Bhāmaha's conception of the figure. Like Daṇḍin, no doubt, he employs the word '*stuti*' in the definition in the definite sense of 'the praise of the aprastuta,' but it is not clear whether this praise of the aprastuta ultimately leads to the apprehension of the censure of the prastuta.

Bhāmaha's illustration of the figure, viz.

प्रीणितप्रणयि स्वादु काले परिणतं बहु ।
विना पुरुषकारेण फलं पश्यत शाखिनाम् ॥

Bhā.Kāvyālaṁkāra III. 28,

may be interpreted as the speech of a man who blames his lot contrasting it with the happy one of the trees. The happy lot of the trees is praiseworthy. For they reap abundant fruit, ripening at the proper time, sweet and pleasing to the supplicants without making any effort whatsoever, *vinā puruṣakāreṇa*. But the trees are aprastuta. The theme of the speaker is to condemn his own unhappy lot in that his efforts to gain prosperity and bestow it on his dependants are all in vain. In this case Bhāmaha's conception of the figure will be the same as that of Daṇḍin We might say:

अत्र विना पुरुषकारेणेदृशं फलं प्राप्तवतां वृक्षाणां सौभाग्यम-प्रस्तुतमेव प्रशस्यते । तच्च निष्फलपुरुषकारस्य कस्यचित् स्व-दौर्भाग्यनिन्दायां प्रस्तुतायां पर्यवस्यति ।

But the illustration of Bhāmaha is capable of an alternative interpretation. The praise of the happy lot of the trees, which is aprastuta, suggests the praise of the similar happy lot of persons who reap good fruits without any effort on their part. That this leads to a

further suggestion of the miserable lot of the speaker is another thing.

In any case the example of Aprastutapras'aṁsā given by Bhāmaha does illustrate the normal fifth variety of later writers. According to the first interpretation it will be an instance of Vaidharmya type while according to the second it will be that of Sādharmya type.

Udbhaṭa

Udbhaṭa (about 750-850 A. D.) adopts Bhāmaha's definition with a slight but significant change. In his *Kāvyālaṁkārasārasaṁgraha* he defines Aprastutapras'aṁsā as follows:

अधिकारादपेतस्य वस्तुनोऽन्यस्य या स्तुतिः ।
अप्रस्तुतप्रशंसेयं प्रस्तुतार्थानुबन्धिनी ॥

Kāvyālaṁkārasārasaṁgraha 59.

Indurāja, commonly known as Pratīhārendurāja, explains this definition of Udbhaṭa as follows:

अधिकारादुपवर्णनावसरादपगतस्य प्राकरणिकादपरस्य वस्तुनो यत्रोपनिबन्धः साप्रस्तुतप्रशंसा ।

Laghuvṛtti P. 65.

So far as Daṇḍin is concerned the name *Aprastutapras'aṁsā* is used in its literal sense. The statement is in the form of a praise, *pras'aṁsā*, of the aprastuta. Not only has Daṇḍin employed the word '*stuti*' in his definition but also he has explained his illustration by adding **अत्र मृगवृत्तिः प्रशस्यते ।**

Bhāmaha retains the word '*stuti*' and though he is not explicit about its meaning, there is no doubt that in his illustration it is the praise, *pras'aṁsā*, of the aprastuta that is meant.

With Udbhaṭa, however, the name Aprastutapras'aṁsā gives up its literal sense of "the praise of the aprastuta." It means, as Indurāja says,

अपरस्य वस्तुन उपनिबन्धः साप्रस्तुतप्रशंसा ।

Laghuvṛtti P. 65.

It is significant to note, therefore, that though Udbhaṭa employs the word '*stuti*' in the definition like Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha, his conception of the figure is quite different from that of his predecessors. According to him Aprastuta-pras'aṁsā is "the statement, *stuti*, of an object removed from the theme of description but conveying with it a sense of the theme of description."

This meaning read by Indurāja in the definition of Udbhaṭa is confirmed by the illustration given by the latter. The stanza:

यान्ति स्वदेहेषु जरामसंप्राप्तोपभोक्तृकाः ।
फलपुष्पर्द्धिभाजोऽपि दुर्गदेशवनश्रियः ॥

Kāvyālaṁkārasārasaṁgraha P. 59

quoted by Udbhaṭa from his own poem *Kumārasambhava*, anticipates the well-known English poet Gray, who laments:

"Full many a flower is born to blush
unseen,
And waste its sweetness on the
desert air."

Apparently the stanza describes the futility of "the rustic charms of inaccessible regions consisting of an abundance of fruits and flowers that wither away in their places not having found any enjoyer." It is intended, however, to suggest the futility of Pārvatī's

beauty and youth which will waste away not having found any enjoyer in her condition of asceticism. Far from being a praise, *stuti*, the illustration is a lament, a censure, *nindā*, of the unhappy circumstance which is aprastuta. It is now easy to see how Udbhaṭa radically modifies the conception of the figure. It is needless to add that the illustration of Aprastutapras'aṁsā given by him can be classed under the well-known fifth variety and that it is a clear case of Anyokti

Udbhaṭa has improved upon Bhāmaha's definition in another respect also. This he has done by adding the words **प्रस्तुतार्थानुबन्धिनी.** In this connection Indurāja significantly remarks :

......प्राकरणिकादपरस्य वस्तुनो यत्रोपनिबन्धः साप्रस्तुतप्रशंसा। न चैवमपि तस्या उन्मत्तप्रलापप्रख्यता यतः सा केनचित्स्वाजन्येन प्रस्तुतमर्थमनुबध्नाति।

Laghuvṛtti P. 65.

Vāmana

Vāmana (about 800 A. D.) deals with Aprastutapras'aṁsā in the fourth section of his *Kāvyālaṁkārasūtra*. His definition of the figure is :

(उपमेयस्य) किञ्चिदुक्तावप्रस्तुतप्रशंसा।

Kāvyālaṁkārasūtra IV.3.4.

His Vṛtti explains the definition as follows :

उपमेयस्य किञ्चिल्लिङ्गमात्रेणोक्तौ समानवस्तुन्यासेऽप्रस्तुतप्रशंसा।

Kāvyālaṁkārasūtra IV.3.4.

Vāmana's conception of the figure is peculiar. According to him Aprastutapras'aṁsā consists in just a slight

mention of the object of comparison, which is prastuta, when the aprastuta, the standard of comparison, is fully mentioned. The illustration of the figure given by him is :

लावण्यसिन्धुरपरैव हि केयमत्र
यत्रोत्पलानि शशिना सह संप्लवन्ते।
उन्मज्जति द्विरदकुम्भतटी च यत्र
यत्रापरे कदलिकाण्डमृणालदण्डाः ॥

Kāvyālaṁkārasūtra IV.3.

The Ṭippaṇī *Kāmadhenu* explains this figure in the above stanza as under :

अत्र लावण्यपदार्थेन एकदेशेन उपमेयानां नयनादीनामुक्तौ उत्पलादीनाम् अप्रस्तुतानाम् प्रशंसनाद् अप्रस्तुतप्रशंसा नाम अलङ्कारः ।

Kāmadhenu P. 63.

Mm. Gaṅgānāth Jha in his English Translation of Vāmana's work notes that in the above illustration the beautiful woman, who is the object of comparison, is just slightly mentioned by the pronoun '*iyam*' in the first line. Both Ānandavardhana and Mahimabhaṭṭa quote this stanza as an illustration of guṇībhūtavyaṅgya. Bhoja holds a different opinion regarding the same.

It is true Vāmana, like Udbhaṭa, understands the word 'pras'aṁsā' in the sense of mere description ; but his definition is not at all clear. Moreover it is so worded as to distinguish the figure from Samāsokti of his own conception. Samāsokti, according to Vāmana, consists in the description of the similar thing when the object of comparison is not at all mentioned. Cf. (उपमेयस्य) अनुक्तौ (समानवस्तुन्यासः) समासोक्तिः ।

Kāvyālaṁkārasūtra IV. 3.3.

In other words Vāmana's Samāsokti is the suggestion of the object from the description of a similar thing which is not the object of description. Now this is exactly the definition of our Aprastutapras'aṁsā. For example, the illustration of Samāsokti given by Vāmana, viz.

श्लाघ्या ध्वस्ताध्वगग्लानेः करीरस्य मरौ स्थितिः ।
धिङ् मेरौ कल्पवृक्षाणामनुत्पन्नार्थिनां श्रियः ॥

Kāvyālaṁkārasūtra IV. 3. 3.

is an illustration of Aprastutapras'aṁsā of the Sādṛs'ya variety. In fact Vāmana's illustration of Samāsokti is an Anyokti.

Rudraṭa

The *Kāvyālaṁkāra* of Rudraṭa (between 825 and 875 A.D.), printed in the Kāvyamālā Series with the commentary of Namisādhu (1069 A.D.), is an extensive work in sixteen chapters. According to Rudraṭa there are four basic grounds for classifying the figures of sense, viz. Vāstava, Aupamya, Atis'aya and S'leṣa. In the eighth chapter he deals with the figures of sense based on Aupamya.

Rudraṭa does not employ the word Aprastutapras'aṁsā though he deals with it. He calls it Anyokti and he is the first rhetorician to do so. His definition of Anyokti is:

असमानविशेषणमपि यत्र समानेतिवृत्तमुपमेयम् ।
उक्तेन गम्यते परमुपमानेनेति सान्योक्तिः ॥

Rud. Kāvyālaṁkāra VIII. 74.

The essentials of Anyokti, according to Rudraṭa, are two. In the first place it is the Upamāna, i.e. the aprastuta, that is described. Secondly this Upamāna

suggests the Upameya, i.e. the object of description or the prastuta which has a similar behaviour. Rudraṭa adds that it is not necessary that the Upameya should have similar attributes. It is enough if there is common behaviour, *samāna itivṛtta*, which Namisādhu explains as *tulya vyavahāra.* Rudraṭa is very clear in his definition of Anyokti. He institutes Sādṛs'ya as the relation between the prastuta and the aprastuta and this makes a definite improvement in the definition of Udbhaṭa. Udbhaṭa introduced the words प्रस्तुतार्थानुबन्धिनी in the definition of Bhāmaha. But with him the relation between the prastuta and the aprastuta was any relation, केनचित्स्वाजन्येन as Indurāja explains. With Rudraṭa, however, the relation is that of Sādṛs'ya as implied by *samāna itivṛtta.* Moreover, he is explicit on this point when he says that the two stand in the relation of Upameya and Upamāna. It will be noticed now that Rudraṭa's Anyokti is the Aprastutapras'aṁsā of the earlier writers but distinctly described as based on Sādṛs'ya. Anyokti is illustrated by Rudraṭa in the stanza :

मुक्त्वा सलीलहंसं विकसितकमलोज्ज्वलं सरः सरसम् ।
बकलुलितजलं पल्वलमभिलषसि सखे न हंसोऽसि ॥

Rud. Kāvyālaṁkāra VIII. 75.

According to Namisādhu there is *upālambha*, blame, in the above illustration of Anyokti. A swan is blamed for his desire to resort to a dirty pool of water leaving the beautiful lake. The behaviour of a good man is apprehended from the behaviour of the swan. Cf.

अत्र हंसेनोपमानेनोक्तेन सज्जनः प्रतीयते । तस्य शिष्टजनाधिष्ठितं स्थानं त्यजतः खलं चाश्रयतस्तत्तुल्य उपालम्भ इति ।

Namisādhu on Rud. Kāvyālaṁkāra VIII.75

Agnipurāṇa

Agnipurāṇa (later than the ninth century A. D.) which is a compilation of subjects embracing almost all the branches of scientific knowledge treats of many figures of sense. It defines Aprastutapras'aṁsā under the name of 'stuta' or 'stotra' as follows :

........स्तुतं स्तोत्रमिदं पुनः ।
अधिकारादपेतस्य वस्तुनोऽन्यस्य या स्तुति ॥

Agnipurāṇa. 345.16,

but does not illustrate it. Evidently the definition is borrowed from Bhāmaha with a change in the name of the figure.

Ānandavardhana

Ānandavardhana (about 860–890 A.D.) in his *Dhvanyāloka* Udyota I attempts to establish an independent existence of Dhvani or suggestion in poetry. According to him the Dhvani could not be covered by any of the figures Samāsokti, Ākṣepa, Vis'eṣokti, Paryāyokta, Apahnuti, Dīpaka, Saṁkara and Aprastutapras'aṁsā. Rather these latter would be included in Dhvani if the suggested sense is intended by the poet to be more prominent. Cf.

.......अभिधीयमानस्य प्राधान्येनाविवक्षायां ध्वनावेवान्तः-पातः । इतरथा त्वलङ्कारान्तरमेव ।

Dhvanyāloka I.13.

Along with other figures of sense Ānandavardhana examines the case of Aprastutapras'aṁsā and comes to the above conclusion. In that examination he happens to mention three varieties of Aprastutapras'aṁsā based respectively on Sāmānya vis'eṣabhāva, Nimitta–nimittibhāva and Sārūpya. But unfortunately none of them is illustrated by

him. It is not known from what source Ānandavardhna derives his information regarding the threefold division of the figure. Daṇḍin, Bhāmaha, Udbhaṭa, Vāmana and Rudraṭa, all have mentioned only one type of this figure, evidently based on Sārūpya or Sādṛs'ya between the prastuta and the aprastuta. It is true Udbhaṭa employs the phrase प्रस्तुतार्थानुबन्धिनी which, following the explanation of Indurāja, could imply any number of relations between the prastuta and the aprastuta. But then Udbhaṭa gives only one illustration for the figure which is clearly an Aprastutapras'aṁsā based on Sādṛs'ya. It is possible however to infer that Udbhaṭa might have known the three divisions but chosen to illustrate only one of them.

Abhinavagupta

Abhinavagupta (950 A. D.—1020 A. D.), while commenting upon *Dhvanyāloka* I. 13 and Ānandavardhana's gloss over it, quotes the following definition of Aprastutapras'aṁsā :

अधिकारादपेतस्य वस्तुनोऽन्यस्य या स्तुतिः ।
अप्रस्तुतप्रशंसा सा त्रिविधा परिकीर्तिता ॥

Locana P. 49.

Though the wording of the definition agrees with that given by Bhāmaha it is not correct to say that Abhinavagupta has adopted it from the former. For Bhāmaha does not mention the threefold division. It is impossible to say who was first responsible for distinguishing the three types of the figure. Ānandavardhana knew of the divisions and therefore it may be assumed that some rhetorician of whom we do not know but who

flourished between Rudraṭa and Ānandavardhana was responsible for introducing the division.

Explaining the definition Abhinavagupta says:

अप्रस्तुतस्य च वर्णनं प्रस्तुताक्षेपिण इत्यर्थः। स चाक्षेपस्त्रिविधो भवति। सामान्यविशेषभावात्, निमित्त-निमित्तिभावात् सारूप्याच्च।

Locana P. 49.

Though the definition quoted by Abhinavagupta and the text of the *Dhvanyāloka* give only three types of the figure Abhinavagupta himself gives six varieties, each type according to him being twofold. The Sārūpya type of the Aprastutapras'aṁsā, which is the same as Anyokti, has thus two varieties. Read:

एवं द्वौ प्रकारौ प्रत्येकं द्विविधौ विचार्य तृतीयः प्रकारः परीक्ष्यते सारूप्यलक्षणः। तत्रापि द्वौ प्रकारौ।

Locana P. 51.

Of these two varieties the first is defined as:

अप्रस्तुतात्कदाचिद्वाच्याच्चमत्कारः, व्यङ्ग्यं तु तन्मुखप्रेक्षम्।

Locana P. 51.

Ordinarily in Anyokti, i. e. the Aprastutapraśaṁsā of the Sārūpya type, the aprastuta is vācya and it suggests the prastuta. Now if the expressed aprastuta is more charming than the vyaṅgya prastuta then occurs the first variety. Abhinavagupta illustrates the variety by quoting from his teacher Bhaṭṭa Indurāja:

प्राणा येन समर्पितास्तव बलाद्येन त्वमुत्थापितः
स्कन्धे यस्य चिरं स्थितोऽसि विदधे यस्ते सपर्यामपि।
तस्यास्य स्मितमात्रकेण जनयन्प्राणापहारक्रियां
भ्रातः प्रत्युपकारिणां धुरि परं वेताल लीलायसे॥

Locana P. 51.

According to Abhinavagupta in the above stanza the aprastuta is more charming than the prastuta though suggested :—

अत्र यद्यपि सारूप्यवशेन कृतघ्नः कश्चिदन्यः प्रस्तुत आक्षिप्यते तथाप्यप्रस्तुतस्यैव वेतालवृत्तान्तस्य चमत्कारकारित्वम् ।

Locana P. 51.

The second variety is defined as :—

यदि पुनरचेतनादिनात्यन्तासंभाव्यमानतदर्थविशेषणेनाप्रस्तुतेन वर्णितेन प्रस्तुतमाक्षिप्यमाणं चमत्कारकारि तदा वस्तुध्वनिरेवासौ ।

Locana P. 51.

If the object addressed is aprastuta and inanimate then the intention of the poet is clearly to suggest the similar behaviour of a person. The prastuta here is felt to be more prominent and more charming. Abhinavagupta illustrates this variety by quoting one of his own compositions :

भावव्रात हठाज्जनस्य हृदयान्याक्रम्य यन्नर्तयन्
भङ्गीभिर्विविधाभिरात्महृदयं प्रच्छाद्य यत्क्रीडसे ।
यस्त्वामाह जडं ततः सहृदयंमन्यत्वदुःशिक्षितो
मन्येऽमुष्य जडात्मनः स्तुतिपदं त्वत्साम्यसंभावनात् ।

Locana P. 51.

Explaining the suggested prastuta sense of the illustration he says :

कश्चिन्महापुरुषो वीतरागोऽपि सरागवदिति न्यायेन गाढ-विवेकालोकतिरस्कृततिमिरप्रतानोऽपि लोकमध्ये स्वात्मानं प्रच्छा-दयँल्लोकं च वाचालयन्नात्मन्यप्रतिभासमेवाङ्गीकुर्वंस्तेनैव लोकेन मूर्खोऽयमिति यदावज्ञायते तदा तदीयं लोकोत्तरं चरितं प्रस्तुतं व्यङ्ग्य-तया प्राधान्येन प्रकाश्यते ।

Locana PP. 51–52.

Though Ānandavardhana does not refer to these varieties here they are implied by him. For according to him if the similar aprastuta which is described, vācya, is not intended by the poet to be more prominently felt than the prastuta that is suggested then the figure will be included in Dhvani; otherwise it will be simply alaṁkāra and not a case of Dhvani. Cf.

अप्रस्तुतस्य सरूपस्याभिधीयमानस्य प्राधान्येनाविवक्षायां ध्वनावेवान्तःपातः। इतरथा त्वलङ्कारान्तरमेव।

It is precisely this very distinction that has been pointed out by Abhinavagupta by illustrating the two varieties of the Sārūpyamūlā Aprastutapras'aṁsā. Both the illustrations are no doubt cases of Anyokti. But in the first case the Vetālavṛttānta, though aprastuta, is more charming than the Kṛtaghnavṛttānta which is suggested. For, as Abhinavagupta says,

न ह्यचेतनोपालम्भवदसंभाव्यमानोऽयमर्थो न च हृद्य इति वाच्यस्यात्र प्राधान्यम्।

Locana P. 51.

In the second case the Bhāvas are addressed. They are aprastuta and therefore they suggest the similar behaviour of a great man. But certainly it is absurd to address an inanimate object like the Bhāvas. They therefore are not prominently felt. The first is a case of alaṁkāra, the second is that of Dhvani, Vastudhvani as Abhinavagupta calls it.

While thus Ānandavardhana only indicates here indirectly these two varieties of Aprastutapras'aṁsā based on Sārūpya and while Abhinavagupta also says that there are two varieties of the same, we find that the former speaks of three varieties when he reverts to the treatment of the figure subsequently in the third Udyota of the

Dhvanyāloka. Ānandavardhana discusses the alaṁkāra in the well-known stanza of Dharmakīrti, viz. लावण्यद्रविणव्ययो न गणित: etc. and states his opinion that it is a case of Aprastutapras'aṁsā. Then he says:

अप्रस्तुतप्रशंसायां च यद्वाच्यं तस्य कदाचिद्विवक्षितत्वं कदाचिदविवक्षितत्वं कदाचिद्विवक्षिताविवक्षितत्वमिति त्रयी बन्धच्छाया ।

Dhvanyāloka III. 41.

Evidently the three varieties are of the Sārūpyamūlā type though Ānandavardhana does not say so. The first variety is illustrated by the stanza:

परार्थे य: पीडामनुभवति भङ्गेऽपि मधुरो
यदीय: सर्वेषामिह खलु विकारोऽप्यभिमत: ।
न सम्प्राप्तो वृद्धिं यदि स भृशमक्षेत्रपतित:
किमिक्षोर्दोषोऽसौ न पुनरगुणाया मरुभुव: ।।

Dhvanyāloka P. 273.

Abhinavagupta does not comment upon this illustration here but in the first Udyota where Ānandavardhana has quoted this very stanza to illustrate how *bhakti* is distinguished from *dhvani*, he says:

यद्यपि प्रस्तुतमहापुरुषापेक्षायामनुभवतिशब्दो मुख्य एव तथाप्यप्रस्तुत इक्षौ प्रशस्यमाने पीडाया अनुभवनेनासंभवता पीडावत्त्वं लक्ष्यते ।

Locana. P. 63.

Ānandavardhana gives an alternative illustration, his own composition:

अमी ये दृश्यन्ते ननु सुभगरूपा: सफलता
भवत्येषां यस्य क्षणमुपगतानां विषयताम् ।
निरालोके लोके कथमिदमहो चक्षुरधुना
समं जातं सर्वैर्न सममथवान्यैरवयवै: ।।

Dhvanyāloka P. 273.

Explaining the point of illustration he remarks:

अनयोर्हि द्वयोः श्लोकयोरिक्षुचक्षुषी विवक्षितस्वरूपे एव न तु प्रस्तुते। महागुणस्याविषयपतितत्वादप्राप्तपरभागस्य कस्यचित्स्वरूपमुपवर्णयितुं द्वयोरपि श्लोकयोस्तात्पर्येण प्रस्तुतत्वात्।

Dhvanyāloka P. 274.

In the two illustrations given by Ānandavardhana the descriptions of the '*ikṣu*' and the '*cakṣuṣ*', though they are not prastuta, are yet *intended* by the poets. In other words the descriptions are quite applicable to the things described, and are quite plausible in themselves. This is what Ānandavardhana means by '*vivakṣita.*' This variety is the same as the first one of Abhinavagupta. Mammaṭa would call it वाच्ये प्रतीयमानार्थानध्यारोपमूला.

Ānandavardhana illustrates the second variety by the well-known stanza कस्त्वं भोः कथयामि दैवहतकं मां विद्धि शाखोटकम् etc. Here the aprastuta idea is quite implausible. It is therefore not '*intended*' by the poet, it is '*avivakṣita.*'

नहि वृक्षविशेषेण सहोक्तिप्रत्युक्ती संभवत इत्यविवक्षिताभिधेयेनैवानेन श्लोकेन समृद्धासत्पुरुषसमीपवर्तिनो निर्धनस्य कस्यचिन्मनस्विनः परिदेवितं तात्पर्येण वाक्यार्थीकृतमिति प्रतीयते।

Dhvanyāloka. P. 274.

Not only it is not possible to engage in conversation with a tree but also, it should be added, it is impossible that a tree could have the power to think. In other words here the aprastuta idea becomes plausible not in itself but only if the prastuta is related to it.

This variety corresponds to the second variety of Abhinavagupta and to the वाच्ये प्रतीयमानार्थाध्यारोपमूला of Mammaṭa.

The third variety Ānandavardhana illustrates by the stanza :

उप्पहजाआएॅ असोहिणीएॅ फलकुसुमपत्तरहिआए ।
बोरीएॅ वइं देन्तो पामर हो ओहसिज्जिहसि ॥

Dhvanyāloka P. 274.

Here the aprastuta meaning is with reference to a man who tends a *badarī* tree. It suggests the prastuta meaning of a man keeping a wanton lady. According to Ānandavardhana the vācyārtha is not absolutely plausible. Abhinavagupta says :

वाच्ये एव नियमो नास्तीति न शक्यं वक्तुम् ।

Locana P. 275.

It is not always that a man tending a useless *badarī* tree is laughed at by the people. Though Abhinavagupta comments upon all the three varieties illustrated by Ānandavardhana here, he mentions only two varieties of the Sārūpyamūlā in the first Udyota.

Finally Abhinavagupta mentions *Aprastutapras'aṁsā-dhvani* and illustrates it by the stanza :

दुण्दुल्लन्तो मरिहिसि कण्टअकलिआइं केअइवणाइं ।
मालइकुसुमसरिच्छं भमर भमन्तो ण पावहिसि ॥

Locana P. 142.

Mammaṭa, Hemacandra and Jagannātha quote this stanza to illustrate *dharmopamānaluptā upamā* and *upamānaluptā upamā* respectively. Jagannātha also criticizes the view of Alaṁkāraratnākara and others that it is an instance of Asama alaṁkāra distinguished from Upamā. There is no doubt that the stanza in question is a good instance of Anyokti. Abhinavagupta however says that the alaṁkarā here is suggested :

अत्र प्रियतमेन साकमुद्याने विहरन्ती काचिन्नायिका भ्रमरमेवमाहेति भृङ्गस्याभिधायां प्रस्तुतत्वमेव। न चामन्त्रणाद्-प्रस्तुतप्रशंसा। समाप्तायां पुनरभिधायां वाच्यार्थबलादन्यापदेशता ध्वन्यते।

Locana. P. 142.

This early distinction between the various types of Anyokti is very important for the history of the figure. Subsequent writers like Bhoja, Mammaṭa, Vis'vanātha and Jagannātha enter into elaborate discussions regarding the sub-divisions of the same.

Kuntaka

Kuntaka, the author of *Vakroktijīvita,* was very probably a contemporary of Abhinavagupta. In the third Unmeṣa of his work he deals with the various figures of speech. In the vṛtti on his definition of Aprastuta-pras'aṁsā he says :—

एवं रूपकं विचार्य तद्दर्शनसंपन्निबन्धनामप्रस्तुतप्रशंसामभि-प्रस्तौति। अप्रस्तुतोऽपीत्यादि.........यस्यामप्रस्तुतोऽप्यविवक्षितः पदार्थः वर्णनीयतां प्रति प्राप्यते वर्णनाविषयः संपद्यते किं कुर्वन् प्रस्तुतस्य विवक्षितार्थस्य विच्छित्तिमुपशोभामवतारयन् समुल्लासयन्... ......etc.

Vakroktijīvita III

Ms. no. 114 of 1919–24. B.O.R.I. Fol. 133.

Kuntaka's conception of the figure generally agrees with that of the normal form. What is described by the poet is the aprastuta padārtha, that which is not intended by the poet to be the theme of his say. No doubt Kuntaka implies that the description of the aprastuta suggests the prastuta.

प्रस्तुतं प्रतीयमानतया चेतसि विधाय पदार्थान्तरमप्रस्तुतं तद्विच्छित्तिसंपत्तये वर्णनीयतामस्यामलंकृतौ कवयः प्रापयन्ति ।

Ibid Fol. 133.

What he adds, however, is interesting. Providing as it were the reason why the poet should adopt such an indirect procedure, he says:

प्रस्तुतस्य विवक्षितार्थस्य विच्छित्तिमुपशोभामवतारयन् समुल्लासयन्......etc.

Ibid fol. 133.

Kuntaka is the advocate *par excellence* of Vakrokti and it is Vakrokti that lends charm to poetry. Vakrokti was recognized quite early as the basis of all alaṁkāra; cf.

सैषा सर्वत्र वक्रोक्तिरनयार्थो विभाव्यते ।
यत्नोऽस्यां कविना कार्यः कोऽलंकारोऽनया विना ॥

Bhā. Kāvyālaṁkāra. II. 85;

There is no charm in a plain and direct statement. That is why the poet resorts to this indirect way of suggesting the prastuta through the description of the aprastuta.

Kuntaka is aware of the threefold division of the figure referred to by Ānandavardhana; cf.

साम्यं सम्बन्धान्तरं वा समाश्रित्याप्रस्तुतं प्रस्तुतशोभायै वर्णनीयतां यत्र नयन्ति............etc.

Ibid Fol. 134.

and also

अत्र साम्यं निमित्तिनिमित्तभावः सामान्यविशेषभावश्च । तृतीयमप्यन्तर्भावयितुं प्रयुज्यते.........etc.

Ibid fol. 135.

Kuntaka also contemplates six varieties of the figure but his principle of division is quite different from that

of Abhinavagupta. Each of the three types is twofold according as the padārtha is वाक्यान्तर्भूत or सकलवाक्य-व्यापक; cf.

द्विविधो हि तत्त्वभूतः पदार्थः संभवति। वाक्यान्तर्भूत-पदमात्रसिद्धो यः सकलवाक्यव्यापककार्यविविधपरिस्पन्दातिशयविशिष्ट-त्वप्राधान्येन वर्तमानः। तमुभयरूपम्.........etc.

Ibid Fol. 133.

Thus according to Kuntaka there are two varieties of the Aprastutapras'aṁsā based on Sāmya or Anyokti as we would call it. The first is illustrated as follows:—

तत्र साम्यसमाश्रयणाद्वाक्यान्तर्भूताप्रस्तुतपदार्थप्रशंसोदाहरणं यथा—

लावण्यसिन्धुरपरैव हि केयमत्र etc.

The stanza is the same as that given by Vāmana to illustrate his own conception of the figure. It is difficult to see how it could be regarded as an instance of Aprastutapras'aṁsā. Ānandavardhana quotes it as an instance of guṇībhūtavyaṅgya; cf.

तत्र वस्तुमात्रस्य व्यङ्ग्यस्य तिरस्कृतवाच्येभ्यः शब्देभ्यः प्रतीयमानस्य कदाचिद्वाच्यरूपवाक्यार्थापेक्षया गुणीभावे सति गुणीभूतव्यङ्ग्यता। यथा—

लावण्यसिन्धुरपरैव हि केयमत्र etc.

Dhvanyāloka P. 256.

Mahimabhaṭṭa follows Ānanda. The Madhusūdanī vivṛti on the former's work says in this connection :

अत्र नायिकायाः तनूवदननयनस्तनोरुभुजाः लावण्य-सिन्धुशशिप्रभृतितादात्म्येनाध्यवसिताः इत्येवमभेदाध्यवसायात्मिकेय-मतिशयोक्तिः।

Vyaktiviveka P. 137.

Bhoja adds to the confusion. He regards the stanza in question as an illustration of Ubhayokti, a sub-division of Samāsokti, which latter is the same as the normal Anyokti. Explaining the same he says:

अत्रापूर्वेयं लावण्यसिन्धुरित्यन्योक्तिः, यत्रोत्पलानि शशिना सह संप्लवन्त इत्यादिरनन्योक्तिः, सेयमुभययोगादुभयोक्तिरपदिश्यते ।

Sarasvatīkanṭhābharaṇa IV. 102.

Kuntaka illustrates the second variety as follows :—

(साम्यसमाश्रयणात्) सकलवाक्यव्यापकाप्रस्तुतार्थप्रशंसोदाहरणं यथा-

छाया नात्मन एव या कथमसावन्यस्य सानुग्रहा
ग्रीष्मोष्मापदि शीतलस्तलभुवि स्पर्शानिलस्ते कुतः (?) ।
वार्ता वर्षशतैरनेककवलं भावीति वार्तेव सा
द्राघिम्णा मुषिताः कियच्चिरमहो तालेन बाला वयम् ॥

Vakroktijīvita Fol. 134.

This is clearly an instance of Anyokti. After illustrating and explaining the various divisions of Aprastutapras'aṁsā Kuntaka remarks :

तदेवमयमप्रस्तुतप्रशंसाव्यवहारः कवीनामतिविततप्रपञ्चः परिदृश्यते तस्मात्सहृदयैश्च स्वयमेवोत्प्रेक्षणीयः ।

Ibid Fol. 135.

'Very large and extensive is the use of the figure on the part of the poets and therefore the critics themselves should find out what particular type the poet has employed.' Explaining the meaning of the word Aprastutapras'aṁsā he adds :

प्रशंसाशब्दोऽत्र अर्थप्रकाशादिवत् विपरीतलक्षणया गर्हायामपि वर्तते ...... ।

Ibid Fol. 135,

thereby implying that the figure may be sub-divided on the basis of *s'lāghā* and *garhā* also as has been done by Bhoja.

Mahimabhaṭṭa

Mahimabhaṭṭa (between 1020 A. D. and 1050 A. D.), the author of *Vyaktiviveka*, attempts to demolish the theory of Dhvani so arduously built up by Ānandavardhana. He therefore does not deal with figures of speech as such. But in the second Vimars'a of his work while illustrating a Kāvya–doṣa called *avācyavacana* he happens to refer to Aprastutapras'aṁsā alaṁkāra. He gives two illustrations, the first of which is an aprastutapras'aṁsā of the Sāmānya-vis'eṣabhāvamūlā type and the second that of the Sārūpya-mūlā. This latter is as follows:—

द्रविणमापदि भूषणमुत्सवे शरणमात्मभये निशि दीपकः ।
बहुविधार्थ्युपकारभरक्षमो भवति कोऽपि भवानिव सन्मणिः ॥

Vyaktiviveka P. 383.

In the above stanza the poet describes a good gem which is useful in a variety of ways. But the gem is aprastuta. It suggests the prastuta king, whose character is as noble as that of the gem. The point of Mahimabhaṭṭa is that here the poet ought not to have added the words *bhavān iva*, they being understood or suggested by the description of the aprastuta gem. It is therefore a fault called *avācyavacana* :

यत्राप्रस्तुतादेव प्रस्तुतस्यार्थस्य प्रतिबिम्बादिव बिम्बस्य साम्यावगतिर्न तत्रासौ वक्तव्यतामवतरति तदभिधानसामर्थ्यादेव तदवगमाद् उक्ताववाच्यवचनदोषानुषङ्गात् ।

Vyaktiviveka P. 382.

He also quotes another stanza illustrating the same doṣa. The stanza in question is :

सद्वृत्ते महति स्वभावसरले बद्धोऽसि यस्मिन्गुणै-
र्युक्ते संयमहेतुतामुपगते यत्रापि विश्राम्यसि ।
तस्याक्षेपपरम्पराभिरभितो दोलायमानस्थिते-
रालानस्य मतङ्गजैष कतमो निर्मूलने दुर्ग्रहः ॥

Vyaktiviveka Pp. 383–384.

The stanza is a typical Anyokti. But Mahimabhaṭṭa finds fault with it. He says:

यत्राप्रस्तुतप्रशंसायामप्रस्तुतस्यार्थस्य श्लेषमुखेनासन्नेवोत्कर्षोऽपकर्षो वा तदितरस्य तथाप्रतिपत्तयेऽभिधीयते नासौ तात्त्विक इति न तत्र तामाधातुमुत्सहते तयोर्बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बभावेनावस्थानोपगमादित्यवाच्य एवासौ तस्य वचनं दोषः ।

Vyaktiviveka P. 383.

His contention is that in the stanza in question the ālāna – the tying post of the elephant – is aprastuta. It suggests the 'good man' who is prastuta. Now the stanza describes certain excellences of the tying post on the strength of 's'leṣa'. The excellences in question belong to the prastuta 'good man.' They certainly do not belong to the post. But on the strength of double meaning adjectives that are used they are imagined to be belonging to the post. Read:

अत्र सद्वृत्तादिभिर्विशेषणैररुन्तुदस्यालानस्याप्रस्तुतस्य श्लेषबलोपकल्पितेन सदाचारत्वादिधर्मसम्बन्धेनोत्कर्षोऽभिहितः । न चासौ वास्तव इति तदुन्मूलनग्रहो गजस्योचित एव न दुष्ट इत्युपालम्भयोग्यत्वं तत्रासिद्धमेव ।

Vyaktiviveka P. 384.

If the elephant does not deserve to be rebuked for attempting to uproot the post how could this aprastuta idea suggest the attempt of an indiscriminate man to ruin a 'good man'?

यच्च बिम्बभूते तस्मिन्नसिद्धं तत्कथं प्रस्तुतेऽर्थे दर्पण-प्रतिमे प्रतिबिम्बीभवेत् ।

Vyaktiviveka P. 384.

Thus Mahimabhaṭṭa argues that it is a fault to describe the excellence of the ālāna through s'leṣa. Whatever the merit of his views on the question Mahimabhaṭṭa's references to the figure are interesting. In the first place he introduces a new relation between the aprastuta and the prastuta, viz. that of 'bimbapratibimbabhāva'. And secondly he speaks of that kind of Aprastutapras'aṁsā where the aprastuta suggests the prastuta on the strength of 's'leṣa'. It is important to remember here that later writers like Mammaṭa sub-divide the Sārūpyamūlā type on the basis of 's'leṣa' also.

Bhoja

Bhoja (1005--1054 A. D.), the author of the *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa*, a voluminous work on Sanskrit Poetics, has an altogether different conception of the figure. He defines Aprastutapras'aṁsā as:

अप्रस्तुतप्रशंसा स्यादस्तोतव्यस्य या स्तुतिः । कुतोऽपि हेतोः......

Sar. Kaṇṭhā. IV. 52.

According to him the figure consists in the praise of a thing that deserves no praise at all. He illustrates one of its varieties by quoting the well-known stanza मेदश्छेदकृशोदरं लघु भवत्युत्थानयोग्यं वपुः etc. from the S'ākuntala of Kālidāsa.

अत्र यथोक्तैर्हेतुभिः स्वाभिप्रायसाधनेन यदिदमीदृग्विनोदः कुत इति साक्षान्मृगयाभिनन्दनं सेयं वाच्या नामाप्रस्तुतस्तुतिः 'अहिंसा परमो धर्मः' इति धर्मं बाधते ।

Sar. Kaṇṭhā. IV. 111.

From his treatment of the figure and the several stanzas that he has quoted to illustrate its varieties it appears that Bhoja's Aprastutapras'aṁsā is not *aprastuta-pras'aṁsā* but *apras'asta–pras'aṁsā*, if we can use such a term. Like Vāmana therefore he strikes a different note. But strange as it may seem, also like Vāmana his Samāsokti is the normal Aprastutapras'aṁsā. His definition of Samāsokti is :—

यत्रोपमानादेवैतदुपमेयं प्रतीयते ।
अतिप्रसिद्धेस्तामाहुः समासोक्तिं मनीषिणः ॥

Sar. Kaṇṭhā. IV. 46.

It will be readily seen from the definition that Bhoja's Samāsokti is not at all different from S'ādṛs'yamūlā type of Aprastutapras'aṁsā. Bhoja first enumerates eight varieties of the figure :

प्रतीयमाने वाच्ये वा सादृश्ये सोपजायते ।
श्लाघां गर्हामुभे नोभे तदुपाधीन्प्रचक्षते ॥

Sar. Kaṇṭhā. IV. 47.

The Sādṛs'ya may be either suggested or expressed; each of these two main types may be again fourfold according as the stanza contains praise or censure or both or neither. This brings the number of the varieties to eight. Subsequently Bhoja says that the latter, i.e. the vācya-sādṛs'yamūlā varieties may be, each one of them, twofold according as they are तुल्याकारविशेषणा and तुल्यातुल्य-विशेषणा—

विशेष्यमात्रभिन्नाऽपि तुल्याकारविशेषणा ।
अस्त्यसावपराप्यस्ति तुल्यातुल्यविशेषणा ॥

Sar. Kaṇṭhā. IV. 48

Finally Bhoja adds an illustration (IV. 97) with the words प्रतीयमानाभिधीयमानसादृश्या श्लाघागर्हावती तुल्या-

तुल्यविशेषणा. This means that besides the two main types he also contemplates a third main type called प्रतीयमानाभिधीयमानसादृश्या. This last will have the same number of varieties as the vācyā type, viz. eight. The total number of Samāsoktis, therefore, contemplated by Bhoja comes to twenty. Of these he illustrates all the four varieties of the pratīyamānā type. Of the eight varieties of the vācyā type he illustrates only one, viz. अभिधीयमान-सादृश्या श्लाघावती तुल्याकारविशेषणा. Similarly of the last eight varieties he illustrates also only one. All the six illustrations of the various types of Samāsokti given by Bhoja are clear cases of typical Anyokti. One of them may be quoted here :—

किं जातोऽसि चतुष्पथे यदि घनच्छायोऽसि किं छायया
संपन्नः फलितोऽसि किं यदि फलैः पूर्णोऽसि किं संनतः ।
हे सद्वृक्ष सहस्व संप्रति शिखाशाखाशताकर्षण-
क्षोभोन्मोटनभञ्जनानि जनतः स्वैरेव दुश्चेष्टितैः ॥

Sar. Kaṇṭhā. IV. 93.

After having enumerated the varieties Bhoja explains the significance of the name *Samāsokti* and adds that *it is also called Anyokti*, Ananyokti and Ubhayokti. Read :

संक्षेपेणोच्यते यस्मात्समासोक्तिरियं ततः ।
सैवान्योक्तिरनन्योक्तिरुभयोक्तिश्च कथ्यते ॥

Sar. Kaṇṭhā. IV. 49.

It appears Bhoja is trying to strike a compromise between Daṇḍin and Vāmana on the one hand and Rudraṭa on the other. It has been already noted that Vāmana's Samāsokti is the same as the Anyokti. Both Vāmana and Rudraṭa are dealing in reality with the Aprastutapras'aṁsā based on Sārūpya. One calls it Samāsokti because of 'the brevity of expression'; cf.

संक्षेपवचनात्समासोक्तिरित्याख्या ।

Kāvyālaṁkarasūtra IV. 3. 3.

The other designates it as Anyokti because an irrelevant matter is described in order to suggest a similar thing with similar conduct. And Bhoja says that the Samāsokti is called Anyokti.

But Bhoja does not stop there. In the vṛtti he gives the varieties of Anyokti and even illustrates them *as if they were distinct from the varieties of Samāsokti* that he has already described, adding at the same time that the Anyokti is the same as Samāsokti because संक्षेपोक्तिरूपत्वात्. All this reveals a state of confusion in the mind of Bhoja. About Anyokti he says :

अन्योक्तिर्द्विधा स्वजातौ जात्यन्तरे च । तयोः स्वजातौ यथा—

लक्ष्मीपयोधरोत्सङ्गकुङ्कुमारुणितो हरेः ।
बलिरेष स येनास्य भिक्षापात्री कृतः करः ॥

Sar. Kaṇṭhā. IV. 98.

Bhoja has taken this stanza from Dhanika's commentary on the Das'arūpaka where Dhanika claims that it is his own composition and illustrates Dānavīra Rasa. Bhoja explains the Anyokti in the stanza as follows :—

अत्र हरिशब्देन बलिशब्देन वा कश्चित्समानेतिवृत्तः पुंविशेष एवोच्यते सेयं स्वजातिविषयान्योक्तिः संक्षेपोक्तिरूपत्वात्समासोक्तिरेव ।

Sar. Kaṇṭhā IV. 98.

The stanza is neither Samāsokti nor Anyokti.

Bhoja illustrates the second variety of Anyokti by the stanza ;

पिबन्मधु यथाकामं भ्रमरः फुल्लपङ्कजे ।
अप्यसंनद्धसौरभ्यं पश्य चुम्बति कुड्मलम् ॥

Sar. Kaṇṭhā. IV. 99.

Now this stanza is given by Daṇḍin as an illustration of Samāsokti. This makes the confusion worse confounded. Daṇḍin's Samāsokti is Bhoja's Anyokti and Bhoja's Samāsokti is the normal Anyokti!

The root cause of all this confusion is the definition of Samāsokti given by Daṇḍin. He says :—

वस्तु किंचिदभिप्रेत्य तत्तुल्यस्यान्यवस्तुनः ।
उक्तिः संक्षेपरूपत्वात्सा समासोक्तिरिष्यते ॥

Kāvyādars'a 205.

The substance of Daṇḍin's definition of Samāsokti closely agrees with that of Anyokti given by Rudraṭa. But perhaps it was not realised that Daṇḍin had attempted to distinguish Samāsokti by explaining the significance of its name, with the words संक्षेपरूपत्वात्. Prabhā, commenting on the same, says :

समासेन संक्षेपेण अर्थद्वयकथनात् समासोक्तिः ।
संक्षेपश्च एकस्य प्रयोगेणोभयार्थप्रतिपादनात् ज्ञेयः ।

In the illustration of Samāsokti given by Daṇḍin if the Bhramara-vṛttānta is prastuta and the suggested Kāmijana-vṛttāntais aprastuta then it will be a case of Samāsokti. Otherwise that of Aprastutapras'aṁsā, i. e. Anyokti. The want of preciseness with which Daṇḍin framed his definition and the vagueness about the nature of his illustrations were responsible for the confusion between Samāsokti and Aprastutapras'aṁsā. Explaining the Anyokti in the same stanza Bhoja says :

अत्र भ्रमरशब्देन कश्चित्कामी, फुल्लपङ्कजशब्देन काऽपि प्रौढाङ्गना कुड्मलशब्देन काऽपि मुग्धाङ्गनाभिधीयते ।

Sar. Kaṇṭhā. IV. 99.

It is interesting to note that in the above explanation Bhoja adopts the word अभिधीयते and not प्रतीयते. This confusion created by the peculiar views of Daṇḍin, Vāmana and Bhoja is noticed by subsequent writers like Appayya Dikṣita and Jagannātha who clearly distinguish between Samāsokti and Aprastutapras'aṁsā based on Sārūpya. Bhoja's keen desire to combine the views of different writers is also noticed in his citation of the stanza लावण्यसिन्धु० etc. as an instance of Ubhayokti Samāsokti.

Finally Bhoja mentions Anyāpades'a as one of the sub-divisions of Bhāvika alaṁkāra. He defines Bhāvika as :

स्वाभिप्रायस्य कथनं यदि वाप्यन्यभावना ।
अन्यापदेशो वा यस्तु त्रिविधं भाविकं विदुः ॥

Sar. Kaṇṭhā IV. 86,

and illustrates the Anyāpades'a by the stanza :

आसाइअमण्णाएण जेत्तिअं च्चिअ विहिणम् ।
ओरमसु वसह एण्हिं रक्खिज्जइ गहवइच्छेत्तम् ॥

Sar. Kaṇṭhā. IV. 234.

Bhoja adds in this connection the following :

अत्र परक्षेत्रस्य घस्मरवृषनिवारणापदेशेन चिरात्परिज्ञात उपपतिर्निवार्यते, तदिदमन्यापदेशाख्यं भाविकम् ।

Sar. Kaṇṭhā. IV. 234.

It has become usual to designate the Anyokti as Anyāpades'a also. But in the light of the definition of Bharata's *manoratha* quoted before and of Bhoja's Anyāpades'a and its illustration it becomes necessary to distinguish between Anyokti and Anyāpades'a.

Both the Anuṣṭubh and Upajāti lists of the Lakṣaṇas given by Bharata mention Manoratha. Abhinavagupta illustrates it as follows:

णिग्गंधदुरारोहिं पुत्तअ मा पाडलिं समारूढ ।
आरूढणिवडिआ के इमीए ण कआ इह ग्गामे ॥

अत्र पादपमारोहन्नेव वृद्धविदग्धया कश्चिद्दुराशयपुंश्चलीसंग-मोत्सुकः स्वाभिप्रायद्योतनेन प्रबोध्यते तत्प्रस्तुतमेवान्यदुपदिश्य ।

G. O. S. Nāṭyas'āstra Vol. II P. 310.

The stanza is V. 68 of the *Gāthā Saptas'atī*. A clever old woman, on seeing a young man climbing a Pāṭala tree, warns him against a wicked woman who is the object of his love. We have quoted Kālidāsa in the beginning. The speech of Priyaṁvadā and Anasūyā is apparently an address to a *Cakravākavadhū*. But really it is intended to be a *warning* for S'akuntalā. The song of Haṁsapadikā is apparently an address to a bee. But it is clearly intended to be a *rebuke* aimed at Duṣyanta. The distinction between these two statements from Kālidāsa can be easily seen. One is a warning, *prabodhana* as Abhinavagupta would call it; the other is an *upālambha* as Kālidāsa himself has described it.

Abhinavagupta's illustration of *manoratha*, which is defined by employing the word *anyāpades'akathana*, and Bhoja's example of Anyāpades'a cited above are both warnings, *prabodhana*. At the end of his illustration Abhinavagupta adds:

अत एवाप्रस्तुतप्रशंसा साऽपि चात्रैवान्तर्भूता ।

G. O. S. Nāṭyas'āstra Vol. II P. 310.

It should be noted, however, that the variant version of Abhinavagupta's commentary on the chapter on Lakṣaṇas printed as a supplement in the G. O. S. edition

of the *Nāṭyas'āstra* gives a different illustration for Manoratha, viz.,

मनोरथो यथा विकटनितम्बाप्रहसने विकटनितम्बाह—

अन्यासु तावदुपमर्दसहासु भृंग
लोलं विनोदय मनः सुमनोलतासु ।
मुग्धाननामरजसं कलिकामकाले
बालां कदर्थयसि किं नवमालिकायाः ॥

अत्रात्मानमेव सुमनोलतात्वेनापदिशति ।

G. O. S. Nāṭyas'āstra Vol. II P. 362.

Vis'vanātha, the author of *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, defines Manoratha as follows:

मनोरथस्त्वभिप्रायस्योक्तिर्भङ्ग्यन्तरेण यत् ।

Sāhityadarpaṇa VI. 193.

His illustration is:

रतिकेलिकलः किञ्चिदेष मन्मथमन्थरः ।
पश्य सुभ्रु समालम्भात्कादम्बश्चुम्बति प्रियाम् ॥

Sāhityadarpaṇa VI. 193.

Mammaṭa

Mammaṭa's (1050 A. D.–1100 A. D.) treatment of the figure is well-known. He defines it as follows:

अप्रस्तुतप्रशंसा या सा सैव प्रस्तुताश्रया ।

Kāvyaprakās'a X. 12.

'What is called Aprastutapras'aṁsā is literally so (i. e. statement of the thing not under consideration), on the basis of the thing under consideration.'

Mammaṭa translates the word '*pras'aṁsā*' in the definition by '*abhidhāna*;' cf.

अप्राकरणिकस्याभिधानेन प्राकरणिकस्याक्षेपोऽप्रस्तुतप्रशंसा ।

Kāvyaprakās'a X. 12.

Pradīpa makes the point clear by saying :

अप्रस्तुतस्य प्रशंसा वर्णनम् । सैव अप्रस्तुतप्रशंसैवेत्यर्थः । प्रस्तुताश्रया प्रकृतप्रतिपत्तिहेतुः ।

Pradīpa on *Kāvyaprakās'a* X. 12.

Mammaṭa follows Abhinavagupta in his treatment of the figure. For not only does he employ the word '*ākṣepa*' to designate the suggestion of the prastuta but also adopts the principle of division followed by the latter in his *Locana*, viz., that of Kārya-kāraṇabhāva, Sāmānya-vis'eṣabhāva and Sārūpya :

कार्ये निमित्ते सामान्ये विशेषे प्रस्तुते सति ।
तदन्यस्य वचस्तुल्ये तुल्यस्येति च पञ्चधा ॥

Kāvyaprakās'a X. 13.

But while Abhinavagupta gives only two varieties of the Sārūpyamūlā type, Mammaṭa gives three based respectively on s'leṣa, samāsokti and simple resemblance :

तुल्ये प्रस्तुते तुल्याभिधाने त्रयः प्रकाराः । श्लेषः समासोक्तिः सादृश्यमात्रं वा तुल्यात्तुल्यस्य ह्याक्षेपे हेतुः ।

Kāvyaprakās'a X. 13.

This well-known fifth type of Aprastutapras'aṁsā, of which Mammaṭa first mentions three varieties, is the same as Anyokti though he does not say so. According to him the prastuta is suggested by the description of the aprastuta on account of the '*tulyatā*' existing between the two. This *tulyatā* may be due either to s'leṣa embracing the vis'eṣaṇas and the vis'eṣya both or to s'leṣa embracing only the vis'eṣaṇas or to simple resemblance. Thus the first variety of Anyokti given by Mammaṭa is based on s'leṣa. It is distinguished from the arthālaṁkāra '*s'leṣa*' by the fact that in the latter both the meanings are either prastuta or aprastuta. Mammaṭa illustrates this variety by the stanza :—

पुंस्त्वादपि प्रविचलेद्यदि यद्यधोऽपि
यायाद्यदि प्रणयने नमहानपि स्यात् ।
अभ्युद्धरेत्तदपि विश्वमितीदृशीयं
केनापि दिक्प्रकटिता पुरुषोत्तमेन ॥

Kāvyaprakās'a X. 52.

Commenting on the same *Pradīpa* says :—

अत्र पुंस्त्वादित्यादिविशेषणानां पुरुषोत्तमेनेति विशेष्यस्य च श्लेषात्सत्पुरुषप्रतिपत्तिः । न च श्लेष एवायम् । 'अवयवशक्तेः समुदायशक्तिर्बलीयसी' इति न्यायात्प्राग्विष्णूपस्थितौ सत्पुरुषस्याऽऽक्षेपेणैवोपस्थितेः ।

Pradīpa X. 52.

Hemacandra criticizes this view of Mammaṭa regarding s'leṣamūlā variety by saying :

विशेष्यश्लिष्टता तु अन्योक्तिप्रयोजकतया न वाच्या ।

Hema. Kāvyānus'āsana VI. 8

He quotes the illustration of Mammaṭa, without naming him, and says :

अत्र पुरुषोत्तमशब्दस्यार्थद्वयवाचकत्वेऽपि सत्पुरुषचरितस्य प्रस्तुतत्वादभिधा एकत्र नियन्त्रितेति सत्पुरुष एव वाच्यो न विष्णुस्तच्चरितस्याप्रकृतत्वात् । तत्प्रतिपत्तिस्तु शब्दशक्तिमूलाद् ध्वनेरेव ।

Hema. Kāvyānus'āsana VI. 8.

Thus according to Hemacandra there could be no such variety as s'leṣamūlā where even the vis'eṣya is s'liṣṭa. He regards Mammaṭa's illustration of the same as a case of dhvani based on *s'abdas'akti*. This difference of opinion between Mammaṭa and Hemacandra arises from the fact that in such a case it becomes always difficult to decide what is prastuta and what is aprastuta. Mammaṭa quotes the stanza from *Bhallaṭas'ataka* which is a

compilation of Anyoktis and therefore he is justified in regarding Viṣṇu's description in the stanza as aprastuta. Vis'vanātha follows him in regarding it as Anyokti of the s'leṣamūlā variety.

The second variety of Anyokti mentioned by Mammaṭa is described by him as being based on Samāsokti. His terminology is misleading. Anyokti is an antithesis of Samāsokti and therefore it could not be based on Samāsokti. What Mammaṭa means is that in this variety the similarity between the aprastuta and the prastuta is due to s'liṣṭa vis'eṣaṇas only, a circumstance which also obtains in Samāsokti. Vis'vanātha notices this inaccuracy in Mammaṭa's terminology and therefore he improves upon him by saying:

तुल्ये प्रस्तुते तुल्याभिधाने च द्विधा श्लेषमूला सादृश्यमूला च। श्लेषमूलाऽपि समासोक्तिवद्विशेषणमात्रश्लेषे श्लेषवद्विशेष्यस्यापि श्लेषे भवतीति द्विधा।

Sāhityadarpaṇa X. 59-60.

Jagannātha is more critical when he says:

यत्तु 'येनास्यभ्युदितेन...तस्यैव पादग्रहः' इत्यत्र समासोक्तिरनुग्राहिका इति मम्मटभट्टैरुक्तं तत्र विचार्यते। अत्र विशेषणसाम्यमहिम्ना प्रतीयमानः कापुरुषवृत्तान्तः किं प्रस्तुत आहोस्विदप्रस्तुतः। आद्ये समासोक्तेर्विषय एव नास्ति।... द्वितीयेऽप्रस्तुतप्रशंसाया नास्ति विषयः। तस्माच्छ्लिष्टविशेषणोपक्षिप्तद्वितीयार्थमात्रं समासोक्तिरित्यभिप्रायेण यथाकथंचित्सङ्गमनीयम्।

Rasagaṁgādhara Pp. 538–539.

Both *Pradīpa* and *Udyota*, being conscious of the same difficulty, remark:

विशेषणविशेष्यवाचिनां सर्वेषामपि श्लिष्टत्वस्य विशेषणमात्रवाचिनो वा श्लिष्टत्वस्य ...... प्रकृताक्षेपहेतुत्वात्।

Pradīpa on *Kāvya*, *Pr*. X 13.

and

प्रकाशे श्लेषसमासोक्तिपदे श्लिष्टशब्दश्लिष्टविशेषणपरे ।

Udyota, Kāvya. Pr. X 13.

Mammaṭa illustrates this second variety by the stanza:

येनास्यभ्युदितेन चन्द्र गमितः क्लान्तिं रवौ तत्र ते
युज्येत प्रतिकर्तुमेव न पुनस्तस्यैव पादग्रहः ।
क्षीणेनैतदनुष्ठितं यदि ततः किं लज्जसे नो मनाग–
स्त्वेवं जडधामता तु भवतो यद्व्योम्नि विस्फूर्जसे ॥

Kāvyaprakās'a X. 53.

Here is a "rebuke administered to the moon who, though obscured by the sun, clings to his *pādas* and is *jaḍa* enough to parade himself on high." But the rebuke to the moon is aprastuta. *Udyota* explains:

क्षीणधनः कश्चिदुपजीवनार्थमपकारिणं सधनमनुसरन् केनचि–दुपालभ्यते । .... अत्र श्लिष्टविशेषणमात्रमाहात्म्येन प्रस्तुत–सधननिर्धनवृत्तान्ताक्षेपः ।

Udyota, Kāvya. Pr. X. 53.

Kuntaka contemplated this variety when he said:

वर्णानां सामान्यमात्रवृत्तिर्वा ।

Vakroktijīvita Fol. 135.

According to Bhoja's scheme this variety of Anyokti will be अभिधीयमानसादृश्या गर्हावती श्लेषवत्तुल्यविशेषणा नाम समासोक्तिः ।

The third variety is based on mere resemblance. The behaviour of the aprastuta object suggests the similar behaviour of the object of description on account of extreme similarity between the two. Mammaṭa illustrates this variety by the stanza:

आदाय वारि परितः सरितां मुखेभ्यः
किं तावदर्जितमनेन दुरर्णवेन ।
क्षारीकृतं च वडवादहने हुतं च
पातालकुक्षिकुहरे विनिवेशितं च ॥

Kāvya. Pr. X. 54.

Here the poet criticizes a thoughtless man who accumulates good things only to misuse them. This is suggested by the description of the ocean which receives sweet water from rivers only to render it salty, waste it in the mouth of the sub-marine fire and hoard it in the hollow of the earth.

Udyota says:

अत्र ग्रासकल्पं परधनमपहृत्य विफलव्ययकर्तरि दुरीश्वरे प्रकृते तत्सदृशस्याप्रकृतस्यार्णवस्य कथनम् ।

Kāvya. Pr. X. 54.

Kṣemendra in his *Aucityavicāracarcā* attributes the stanza to Bhaṭṭendurāja and says:

अत्र महार्णवव्यपदेशेनान्यायोपार्जितद्रविणदुर्व्ययकारिणः सत्संविभागविमुखस्य कस्यचिदुच्यते ।

Here the suggestion is on the basis of mere similarity between the behaviour of the ocean and that of the thoughtless man.

अत्र श्लेषाभावेऽपि सादृश्यमात्रेणासत्पुरुषाक्षेपः ।

Pradīpa on *Kāvya. Pr. X.* 54.

After having illustrated the three varieties of the figure based on *tulyatā*, Mammaṭa introduces another principle of division for the same, saying:

इयं च क्वचिद्वाच्ये प्रतीयमानार्थानध्यारोपेणैव भवति, क्वचिदध्यारोपेणैव क्वचिदंशेष्वध्यारोपेण ।

This principle of division is nearly the same as that of Ānandavardhana. The *vācyārtha* may be plausible in itself, or it may be implausible or it may be partly plausible and partly implausible. In the first case the description of the aprastuta *is* plausible and hence it does not require the super–imposition, *adhyāropa*, of the suggested prastuta sense over it to render it plausible. This is the same as the *vivakṣita–vācya* variety of Ānandavardhana. Mammaṭa gives the following as its illustration :

अब्धेरम्भःस्थगितभुवनाभोगपातालकुक्षेः
पोतोपाया इह हि बहवो लङ्घनेऽपि क्षमन्ते ।
आहो रिक्तः कथमपि भवेदेष दैवात्तदानीं
को नाम स्यादवटकुहरालोकनेऽप्यस्य कल्पः ॥

Kāvyaprakās'a X. 55.

In the second case the aprastuta vācyārtha is implausible in itself and therefore requires the super–imposition, *adhyāropa*, of the suggested prastuta to make itself plausible. This variety of Mammaṭa corresponds to the *avivakṣita–vācya* variety of Ānandavardhana. Mammaṭa cites the same stanza, viz.,

कस्त्वं भोः कथयामि दैवहतकं मां विद्धि शाखोटकं
वैराग्यादिव वक्षि साधु विदितं कस्मादिदं कथ्यते ।
वामेनात्र वटस्तमध्वगजनः सर्वात्मना सेवते
न च्छायाऽपि परोपकारकरणे मार्गस्थितस्याऽपि मे ॥

Kāvyaprakās'a X. 56,

as an example. Here is the lament of a lowly born person desirous of bestowing gifts on others. His complaint however is that people would not accept gifts from him because he is lowly born ; rather they would resort to a high-born person though he may be wicked. This is suggested by the *s'ākhoṭaka–vṛttānta*.

The third variety in which the vācyārtha is partly plausible and partly implausible and therefore requires a partial *adhyāropa* is illustrated by Mammaṭa through the following stanza:

> सोऽपूर्वो रसनाविपर्ययविधिस्तत्कर्णयोश्चापलं
> दृष्टिः सा मदविस्मृतस्वपरदिक् किं भूयसोक्तेन वा।
> सर्वं विस्मृतवानसि भ्रमर हे यद्वारणोऽद्याप्यसा–
> वन्तःशून्यकरो निषेव्यत इति भ्रातः क एष ग्रहः॥

Kāvyaprakās'a X. 57.

Here is an address to a bee suggestive of the behaviour of a repulsive master and a devoted servant. The *rasanā-viparyaya*, *madavatva* and *antaḥs'ūnyakaratva* are no reasons why the bee should avoid the elephant. On the contrary *mada* is a reason why the bee should resort to the elephant. Thus in respect of these three reasons the vācyārtha is implausible in itself and to render it plausible it is necessary that the suggested idea of a *nivāraka prabhu* should be super–imposed on it.

एवं च रसनाविपर्ययादौ वचनास्थैर्यादिकमारोप्य भ्रमरे प्रपन्नसेवकत्वमारोप्य वारणे निवारकप्रभुत्वमारोप्य वाक्यार्थोपपत्तिरिति भावः।

Udyota on Kāvya. Pr. X. 57.

According to Hemacandra this third variety of Mammaṭa corresponds to that of Ānandavardhana, for in his *Viveka* under *Kāvyānus'āsana VI. 8* he notices the above illustration of Mammaṭa as an alternative example of the vivakṣita-avivakṣita variety of Ānandavardhana. There is however a difference between the two. Commenting upon the latter's illustration, viz., उप्पहजायाए असोहिणीए etc. Hemacandra himself remarks:

अत्र वाच्यार्थो नात्यन्तं संभवी न चासंभवीति वा वक्तुं शक्यम् । व्यङ्ग्यस्यापि भावात् ।

Viveka on *Kāvyānu.* *VI.* 8.

This second principle of dividing the Sādṛs'yamūlā type of Aprastutapras'aṁsā involving *adhyāropa* is not exclusive of the earlier principle based on s'leṣa etc. In reality, therefore, Mammaṭa contemplates nine varieties of Anyokti.

Ruyyaka

The *Alaṁkārasarvasva* of Ruyyaka composed between 1135 A.D. and 1150 A.D. defines Aprastutapras'aṁsā as follows :

अप्रस्तुतात्सामान्यविशेषभावे कार्यकारणभावे सारूप्ये च प्रस्तुतप्रतीतावप्रस्तुतप्रशंसा ।

Alaṁkārasarvasva P. 132.

Like Mammaṭa Ruyyaka divides the figure into five types. But unlike the former he first divides the Sārūpyamūlā type into two varieties.

तत्रापि सारूप्यहेतुके भेदे साधर्म्यवैधर्म्याभ्यां द्वैविध्यम् ।

Alaṁkārasarvasva P. 133.

After illustrating the four varieties based on Sāmānya-vis'eṣabhāva and Kāryakāraṇabhāva Ruyyaka adds :

एतानि साधर्म्योदाहरणानि ।

Ibid P. 137.

The text of Ruyyaka is discrepant here. He has not illustrated the Sārūpyamūlā of the Sādharmya variety and yet he says that the 'above are the illustrations of the Sādharmya type.' This discrepancy is noticed by his commentator Jayaratha who remarks ;

इह च सारूप्येण साधर्म्योदाहरणानां पूर्वमनुद्दिष्टानामप्येतानि साधर्म्योदाहरणानीत्यनेनातिदेशवाक्येनेति निश्चिनुमः। अयं हि ग्रन्थो ग्रन्थकृतः पश्चात्कैरपि पत्रिकाभिर्लिखित इति प्रसिद्धिः। तैश्चानवधानादुदाहरणपत्रिका न लिखिता। अतिदेशवाक्यं च पत्रिकान्तराल्लिखितमिति ग्रन्थस्यासंगतत्वम्।

Vimarṣinī P. 137

The vaidharmya variety is illustrated by the stanza:

धन्याः खलु वने वाताः कह्लारस्पर्शशीतलाः।
राममिन्दीवरश्यामं ये स्पृशन्त्यनिवारिताः॥

Alaṁkārasarvasva P. 137.

As already noted in the section on Daṇḍin the stanza is an illustration of Aprastutapras'aṁsā because, as Ruyyaka says,

अत्र वाता धन्या इति अप्रस्तुतादर्थादहमधन्य इति वैधर्म्येण प्रस्तुतोऽर्थः प्रतीयते।

Ibid P. 137.

This twofold division of the fifth variety on the basis of *sādharmya* and *vaidharmya* is Ruyyaka's original contribution; for it appears no writer before him has noticed this possibility. Of course Ruyyaka subsequently recognises the normal threefold division like Ānandavardhana and Mammaṭa. But instead of *vivakṣā* or *adhyāropa* he mentions *sambhava* as the basis of division:

वाच्यस्य संभवासंभवोभयरूपताभिस्त्रयः प्रकाराः।

Alaṁkārasarvasva p. 133.

As regards the illustration of the first variety, viz., **वाच्यस्य संभवे,** Ruyyaka says that the illustrations of the Sādharmya type given by him are also those of **वाच्यस्य संभवे.** As already noted these illustrations are missing

from the text. Jayaratha therefore in his commentary quotes three stanzas to illustrate both these points, viz., *sādharmya* and *vācyasya sambhava*. The first of these three is the stanza परार्थे यः पीडामनुभवति etc. given by Ānandavardhana. The rest are:

पातः पूष्णो भवति महते नोपतापाय यस्मा-
त्कालेनास्तं क इव न गता यान्ति यास्यन्ति चान्ये।
एतावत्तु व्यथयति यदालोकबाह्यैस्तमोभि-
स्तस्मिन्नेव प्रकृतिमहति व्योम्नि लब्धोऽवकाशः॥

and

पथि निपतितां शून्ये लब्ध्वा निरावरणाननां
ननु दधिघटीं गर्वोन्नद्धः समुद्धुरकन्धरः।
निजसमुचितास्तास्ताश्चेष्टा विकारशताकुलो
यदि न कुरुते काणः काकः कदा नु करिष्यति॥

At the end of these quotations Jayaratha remarks:

अत्र च सारूप्यं साधर्म्यं वाच्यसंभवश्च स्फुट एव।

Vimarṣinī P. 138.

Ruyyaka illustrates the second variety, viz., *vācyasya asambhave* by the same stanza as given by Ānandavardhana and Mammaṭa. The third is illustrated as follows:—

उभयरूपत्वे यथा—

अन्तश्छिद्राणि भूयांसि कण्टका बहवो बहिः।
कथं कमलनालस्य मा भूवन् भङ्गुरा गुणाः॥

Alaṁkārasarvasva P. 138.

Here, as Ruyyaka says, the *vācyārtha* is partly possible and partly impossible.

अत्र वाच्येऽर्थे कण्टकानां भङ्गुरीकरणे हेतुत्वं संभवि छिद्राणां त्वसंभवीत्युभयरूपत्वम्।

Ibid P. 138.

Ruyyaka also contemplates the division of the Sārūpyamūlā type on the basis of s'leṣa as does Mammaṭa; for he says:

श्लिष्टशब्दप्रयोगे त्वर्थान्तरस्यावाच्यत्वाच्छ्लेषाद्विशेषः ।

Alaṁkārasarvasva P. 133.

Jayaratha adds:

श्लिष्टशब्दनिबन्धनाप्यप्रस्तुतप्रशंसा भवतीत्यनुवादाद्विधिः । अत एवास्य बहुप्रकारत्वमुक्तम् ।

Vimarṣinī P. 133.

For illustrating the same Ruyyaka says that the same stanza, viz., अन्तश्छिद्राणि etc. is also the illustration of the s'liṣṭa variety.

एतदेव च श्लेषगर्भायामस्यामुदाहरणम् ।

Alaṁkārasarvasva P. 138.

Thus Ruyyaka contemplates in all twelve varieties of the Anyokti based on *sādharmya*. Of course an equal number is implied for that based on *vaidharmya*.

At the end of his section on Aprastutapras'aṁsā Ruyyaka differentiates between the Sārupyamūlā and Dṛṣṭānta by saying:

सरूपयोस्तु वाच्यत्वे दृष्टान्तः । अप्रस्तुतस्य वाच्यत्वे प्रस्तुतस्य गम्यत्वे सर्वथाप्रस्तुतप्रशंसेति निर्णयः ।

Ibid P. 138.

What Ruyyaka means is this. In the Sārūpyamūlā type, as also in other types of this figure, the aprastuta alone is vācya. The prastuta is not expressed; it is always gamya, suggested. If the two similar ideas are both vācya, expressed, then the alaṁkāra will be Dṛṣṭānta and not Anyokti. We remember it is Mahimabhaṭṭa who says that there is

bimbapratibimbabhāva between the two sarūpa ideas. In Dṛṣṭānta also it is the same relation. How are the two then distinguished? Ruyyaka says that while in Aprastutapras'aṁsā of the Sārūpyamūlā type, i. e. Anyokti, the aprastuta is *vācya* and the prastuta is *gamya*, in Dṛṣṭānta both are *vācya*. For example in the stanza

अब्धिर्लंघित एव वानरभटैः किन्त्वस्य गंभीरता-
मापातालनिमग्नपीवरतनुर्जानाति मन्थाचलः ।
देवीं वाचमुपासते हि बहवः सारं तु सारस्वतं
जानीते नितरामसौ गुरुकुलक्लिष्टो मुरारिः कविः ॥

Alaṁkārasarvasva P. 96,

quoted by Ruyyaka from *Anargharāghava* of Murāri both, the aprastuta idea of the Vānaras and the Manthācala measuring the depth of the ocean and the prastuta one of lesser poets and Murāri diving into the depths of learning are *expressed*, one illustrating the other. Hence it is a case of Dṛṣṭānta. If the *vānara–manthācala* idea alone had been expressed and the other had been left to be imagined on the strength of similarity it would have been a case of Aprastutapras'aṁsā.

This distinction drawn by Ruyyaka between Aprastutaras'aṁsā and Dṛṣṭānta is noteworthy.

Vāgbhaṭa I

Vāgbhaṭa (1125 A. D.), the author of *Vāgbhaṭālaṁkāra*, holds, like Daṇḍin, peculiar views regarding Aprastutapras'aṁsā. His definition is:

प्रशंसा क्रियते यत्राप्रस्तुतस्यापि वस्तुनः ।
अप्रस्तुतप्रशंसां तामाहुः कृतधियो यथा ।

Vāgbhaṭālaṁkāra IV. 134.

It appears Vāgbhaṭa takes the word *pras'aṁsā* in its literal sense of a praise. His illustration of the figure, viz.,

स्वैरं विहरति स्वैरं शेते स्वैरं च जल्पति ।
भिक्षुरेकः सुखी लोके राजचौरभयोज्झितः ॥

Vāgbhaṭālaṁkāra IV. 135,

corresponds in all its delails to the illustration of the figure given by Daṇḍin, viz., सुखं जीवन्ति हरिणा etc. Following the latter we may explain the point as follows :

सेयमप्रस्तुतैवात्र भिक्षुवृत्तिः प्रशस्यते ।
संसारिजीवनक्लेशनिर्विण्णेन विरागिणा ॥

Thus it is clear that Vāgbhaṭa's conception of the figure is exactly the same as that of Daṇḍin. The poet here censures the life of wordly men, which is full of fears at every step. This he does by praising the free and fearless and therefore the happy life of a bhikṣu who has renounced the wordly ties.

As already mentioned in the section on Daṇḍin this type of Aprastutapras'ṁsā may be regarded as the normal fifth variety of the Vaidharmya type following the scheme of Ruyyaka. And so we may add :

अत्र भिक्षुवृत्तिः प्रशस्ता इति अप्रस्तुतादर्थात् संसारिवृत्ति-र्निन्दिता इति वैधर्म्येण प्रस्तुतोऽर्थः प्रतीयते ।

However, Vāgbhaṭa follows Vāmana and Bhoja in his treatment of Samāsokti alaṁkāra. In other words his Samāsokti is the same as Anyokti. He defines it as follows :

उच्यते वक्तुमिष्टस्य प्रतीतिजननक्षमम् ।
सधर्म यत्र वस्त्वन्यत्समासोक्तिरियं यथा ।

Vāghaṭālaṁkāra IV. 94.

The Samāsokti consists in the description of a similar thing which is capable of suggesting the thing desired to be conveyed. This is exactly the definition of the Sārūpyamūlā type of Aprastutapras'aṁsā. His commentator says in this connection :

यत्र वक्तुमिष्टस्य वस्तुनः प्रतीतिजननक्षमं प्रतीत्युत्पादनसमर्थं सदृशमन्यद्वस्तु उच्यते । इयं समासोक्तिर्भवेत् । नामान्तरेऽन्योक्तिः कथ्यते ।

Vāgbhaṭa gives two illustrations for his Samāsokti, viz.,

मधुकर मा कुरु शोकं विचर करीरद्रुमस्य कुसुमेषु ।
घनतुहिनपातदलिता कथं नु सा मालती मिलति ॥

and

चिन्तयति न चूतलतां याति न जातिं न केतकीं कमते ।
कमलतामग्नमना मधुपयुवा केवलं क्वणति ॥

Vāgbhaṭālaṁkāra IV. 95, 96.

Both are evidently clear cases of Anyokti.

Hemacandra

Hemacandra (about 1140 A. D.) is the next writer after Rudraṭa who calls the figure by the name of Anyokti. In his *Kāvyānus'āsana* he defines Anyokti as follows :

सामान्ये विशेषे कार्ये कारणे प्रस्तुते तदन्यस्य तुल्ये तुल्यस्य चोक्तिरन्योक्तिः ।

Hema. Kāvyānus'āsana VI. 8.

Hemacandra widens the scope of Anyokti. Ordinarily speaking Anyokti is the name given to that type of Aprastutapras'aṁsā which is based on Sārūpya relation. Of the five main types mentioned by Mammaṭa only the

fifth variety, viz., that which is based on the relation of similarity between the prastuta and the aprastuta, is called *anyokti*. Hemacandra admits the same five types but instead of calling them so many types of Aprastuta-pras'aṁsā he calls them Anyoktis. Thus he understands the term *anyokti* in its literal sense and therefore to be applicable to all cases where there is *anyasya uktiḥ*. While explaining the definition he says:

सामान्ये प्रस्तुते तदन्यस्य विशेषस्य, विशेषे सामान्यस्य, कार्ये कारणस्य, कारणे कार्यस्य सदृशे सदृशस्य चान्यस्याप्रस्तुतस्योक्तिरभिधानमन्योक्तिः ।

Alaṁkāracūḍāmaṇi on Kāvyānu. VI. 8.

Of the Anyokti proper Hemacandra admits two varieties.

तुल्ये प्रस्तुते तुल्यस्याभिधाने द्वौ प्रकारौ श्लिष्टविशेषणता सादृश्यमात्रं वा तुल्यात्तुल्यस्याक्षेपहेतुः ।

These two varieties correspond to the Samāsoktimūlā and the Sādṛs'yamātramūlā varieties of Mammaṭa. Hemacandra, however, being conscious of Mammaṭa's inaccurate use of the term '*samāsokti*' in this connection, improves upon him by describing the variety as based on s'liṣṭa adjectives. The prastuta idea is suggested by the description of a similar aprastuta idea. And the similarity is understood on account of s'leṣa. Hemacandra gives the following stanza to illustrate the same:

नालस्य प्रसरो जडेष्वपि कृतावासस्य कोशे रुचि-
दर्ण्डे कर्कशता मुखे च मृदुता मित्रे महान् प्रश्रयः ।
आमूलं गुणसंग्रहव्यसनिता द्वेषश्च दोषाकरे
यस्यैषा स्थितिरम्बुजस्य वसतिर्युक्तैव तत्र श्रियः ॥

Alaṁkāracūḍāmaṇi VI. 8. 561.

Bhoja quotes this stanza as an illustration of अभिधीयमानसादृश्या श्लाघावती तुल्याकारविशेषणा variety of his Samāsokti. According to Bhoja in this stanza the lotus is aprastuta; and on the strength of double-meaning adjectives, which express the similarity, it suggests the behaviour of a noble man. Cf.

अत्राम्बुरुहसत्पुरुषयोः परस्परमुपमानोपमेयभावस्यातिप्रसिद्धेरुपमानेनैव श्लेषवत्तुल्यविशेषणपदाभिधीयमानसादृश्यमुपमानमुपमेयमेवावगम्यते ।

Sar. Kaṇṭhā IV. 96.

The essence of this variety is '*s'leṣa.*' On account of double-meaning adjectives, which are applicable to both, the aprastuta and the prastuta ideas, similarity between the two is apprehended. And this similarity, *tulyatā*, makes it possible for the prastuta to be suggested from the description of the aprastuta. Mammaṭa describes it as *samāsoktimūlā*, because the same circumstance obtains in the Samāsokti alaṁkāra. Bhoja calls it *abhidhīyamāna-sādṛs'yā* and *tulyākāra-vis'eṣaṇā* because the adjectives applicable to the two are the same and again they *express* the similarity. Hemacandra is content to describe it simply as based on s'liṣṭa or similar adjectives; cf.

अत्राप्रस्तुतेनाम्बुजेन तुल्यविशेषणबलात्तुल्यः सत्पुरुष आक्षिप्यते ।

Alaṁkāracūḍāmaṇi VI. 8.561.

Hemacandra illustrates the Sādṛs'yamātramūlā variety by the same stanza as given by Maṁmaṭa, viz., आदाय वारि परितः सरितां मुखेभ्यः etc. It need not be added now that this variety corresponds to the pratīyamāna-sādṛs'yā type of Bhoja's Samāsokti. For according to Bhoja the similarity which suggests the prastuta is itself suggested and not expressed as in the former example.

Hemacandra's criticism of Mammaṭa for his admitting one more variety, viz., that based on vis'eṣyas'liṣṭatā also has been already noted.

Towards the end of his treatment of the figure Hemacandra mentions another independent principle of dividing the Anyokti. It is fourfold according as it contains praise or censure, or both or neither. The principle is the same as that adopted by Bhoja for his Samāsokti:

अन्योक्तिश्च क्वचित्स्तुतिरूपा, यथा 'नालस्य प्रसरः' इति। क्वचिन्निन्दारूपा यथा 'आदाय वारि' इति। क्वचिदुभयरूपा यथा—

निष्कन्दामरविन्दिनीं स्थपुटितोद्देशां स्थलीं पल्वले
जम्बालाविलमम्बु कर्तुमितरा सूते वराकी सुतान्।
दंष्ट्रायां चतुरर्णवोर्मिपटलैराप्लावितायामियं
यस्या एव शिशोः स्थिता विपदि भूः सा पुत्रिणी पोत्रिणी॥

अत्र पूर्वार्धे निन्दा, उत्तरार्धे तु स्तुतिः।

Alaṁkāracūḍāmaṇi 564.

Bhoja has given this very stanza as an illustration of प्रतीयमानसादृश्या उभयवती समासोक्ति. For the last of these four varieties Hemacandra gives also the same illustration as given by Bhoja, viz.,

इतो वसति केशवः पुरमितस्तदीयद्विषा-
मितोऽपि शरणागताः शिखरिपक्षिणः शेरते।
इतोऽपि वडवानलः सह समस्तसंवर्तकै-
रहो विततमूर्जितं भरसहं च सिन्धोर्वपुः।

अत्र निन्दा स्तुतिर्वा विस्मयोक्तावेवास्तमयत इत्यनुभयरूपा।

Alaṁkāracūḍāmaṇi 565.

Evidently Hemacandra is indebted to Bhoja for his fourfold division and illustrations of Anyokti. It should, however, be noted that he understands the term Anyokti in this latter division in its restricted sense of the Sārūpyamūlā type only and not in its wider sense of the Aprastutapras'aṁsā in general. The total number of Anyoktis thus contemplated by Hemacandra would come to eight.

In his *Viveka*, a commentary on the *Kāvyānus'āsana*, Hemacandra quotes extensively from *Dhvanyāloka*, from Abhinava's commentary and from Mammaṭa in connection with the different varieties of the figure. He happens to make certain observations in the course of which he distinguishes between the Sāmānya–Vis'eṣabhāvamūlā and Kārya–Kāraṇabhāvamūlā on the one hand and the Sārūpyamūlā on the other. In this connection he says :—

तुल्ये प्रस्तुते यत्र तुल्यस्याप्रस्तुतस्याभिधानं तत्र विशेषो विशेषेण प्रतीयत इति पूर्वाभ्यो भेदः ।

Viveka P. 359.

Hemacandra draws a fine distinction between the two former varieties and the Sādṛs'yamūlā. In the latter one particular idea, *vis'eṣa*, suggests another particular idea, which is no doubt similar. Evidently this distinction Hemacandra draws on the basis of what Ruyyaka says about the Dṛṣṭāntālaṁkāra and the Anyokti. Ruyyaka distinguishes between these two latter by referring to their *vācyatva* and *gamyatva*. Hemacandra notices that though they are thus distinguished, they agree in this respect that the two related ideas in both of them are particular ideas, vis'eṣas. And this provides a basis for distinguishing the Sārūpyamūlā from the former two varieties.

Jayadeva

Jayadeva (1200–1250 A. D.), the author of *Candrāloka* defines Aprastutapras'aṁsā as follows :—

अप्रस्तुतप्रशंसा स्यात्सा यत्र प्रस्तुताश्रया ।

Kuvalayānanda 66.

The wording of the definition closely agrees with that of Mammaṭa's definition of the figure. But Jayadeva seems to follow Daṇḍin in his conception of the figure. This is evident from the illustration that follows the definition, viz.,

एकः कृती शकुन्तेषु योऽन्यं शक्रान्न याचते ।

Kuvalayānanda 66.

Here the poet *praises* the Cātaka bird for its self-respect in not begging favour from any one except Indra. This praise of the Cātaka indirectly leads to the apprehension of the censure of a person who solicits favours from ignoble men. According to this interpretation the statement will be an illustration of the Sārūpyamūlā of the Vaidharmya type. Appayya Dīkṣita, however, takes it to be of the Sādharmya type. For while explaining the figure in Jayadeva's illustration he says :—

तत्र सारूप्यनिबन्धनाप्रस्तुतप्रशंसोदाहरणमेकः कृतीति । अत्राप्रस्तुतचातकस्य प्रशंसा प्रशंसनीयत्वेन प्रस्तुते तत्सरूपे क्षुद्रेभ्यो याचनान्निवृत्ते मानिनि पर्यवस्यति ।

Kuvalayānanda 66.

According to Appayya the praise of the Cātaka bird, which is aprastuta, leads to the apprehension of the praise of a self-respecting man who is prastuta, he being worthy of praise.

Like Daṇḍin Jayadeva admits only one kind of the figure. But he does not clearly state whether the

praise of the aprastuta is intended to suggest the censure of the prastuta or otherwise. Moreover he admits another alaṁkāra called *Prastutāṅkura*, which is very similar to Anyokti. He defines this new figure as:

प्रस्तुतेन प्रस्तुतस्य द्योतने प्रस्तुताङ्कुरः ।

Kuvalayānanda 67.

If one prastuta idea, which is being described, suggests another prastuta idea that is intended to be suggested then the figure is Prastutāṅkura. Says Appayya:

यत्र प्रस्तुते वर्ण्यमानेनाभिमतमन्यत्प्रस्तुतं द्योत्यते तत्र प्रस्तुताङ्कुरालङ्कारः ।

Kuvalayānanda 67.

Jayadeva gives

किं भृंग सत्यां मालत्यां केतक्या कण्टकेद्भया ।

Kuvalayānanda 67

as an illustration. According to Appayya this is an address to a bee by a lady who is moving in a garden in the company of her lover. The bee haunts the thorny flower of the Ketaki, leaving aside the lovely Mālatī. It is therefore rebuked for its want of discrimination. As the rebuke to the bee *is* intended, the bee becomes prastuta. But at the same time the lady wants to rebuke her lover who is neglecting her and running after another who is likely to be troublesome. The lover is therefore also prastuta.

इह प्रियतमेन साकमुद्याने विहरन्ती काचिद् भृंगं प्रत्येवाहेति वाच्यार्थस्य प्रस्तुतत्वम् । ...... एवं प्रस्तुतेन वाच्यार्थेन भृंगोपालम्भरूपेण वक्त्र्याः कुलवध्वाः सौन्दर्याभिमानशालिन्याः क्रूरजनपरिवृत्तिदुष्प्रधर्षायां परवनितायां....वेश्यायां वा कण्टकसंकुलकेतकीकल्पायां प्रवर्तमानं प्रियतमं प्रत्युपालम्भो द्योत्यते ।

Kuvalayānanda 67.

This new alaṁkāra admitted both by Jayadeva and Appayya Dīkṣita is no doubt a variety of the same Sārūpyamūlā type. Jagannātha enters into an elaborate discussion regarding the propriety in admitting it as a distinct alaṁkāra.

Vidyādhara

Vidyādhara, the author of *Ekāvalī*, composed between 1285 A. D. and 1325 A. D., admits the same five varieties of the Aprastutapras'aṁsā as Mammaṭa. He defines the figure as follows :—

सामान्यविशेषत्वे सारूप्ये कार्यकारणत्वे च ।
अप्रस्तुतप्रशंसा निर्दिष्टा प्रस्तुतस्य गम्यत्वे ॥

Ekāvalī VIII. 27.

Commenting on his own definition Vidyādhara remarks :

प्रस्तुतं व्यङ्ग्यमप्रस्तुतस्य वाच्यस्य सिद्धिमादधातीति वाच्यसिद्ध्यङ्गमिदं गुणीभूतव्यङ्ग्यम् ।

Ekāvalī VIII. 27.

It is improper, says Vidyādhara, to describe a thing which is not prastuta. This impropriety is removed by the suggestion of the prastuta. Thus the suggested idea, the *vyaṅgya*, brings about the accomplishment of the expressed idea, the *vācya*. It is therefore a case of guṇībhūtavyaṅgya in which the suggested sense is subordinate to the expressed sense and serves its purpose.

The question involved in the above discussion is whether Aprastutapras'aṁsā is *dhvani* or distinct from *dhvani*. Ānandavardhana, Abhinavagupta, Appayya Dīkṣita and Jagannātha have discussed this question in detail. For a clear statement of their views see the section at the end of this chapter.

All the illustrations in *Ekāvalī* are composed by the author himself in order to eulogize his patron, Narasiṁha of Utkala. Vidyādhara gives the following as the illustration of the Sārūpyamūlā :—

एणश्रेणी शशकपरिषच्छल्यकानां कुटुम्बं
केकिव्यूहः श्रयति सुखितां यत्र कुत्रापि कुञ्जे ।
कोऽसौ धन्यः कथय सुकृती पादपोऽभ्रंलिहश्री-
र्यस्यच्छायामयमनुसरत्यातपार्तः करीन्द्रः ॥

Ekāvalī VIII. 27.

Explaining the point of suggestion he adds :—

अत्र सरूपादप्रस्तुताद्वाच्यात्तरोः सरूप एव प्रस्तुतो महान्तमपि रक्षितुं क्षमो नरसिंहमहीपतिः प्रतीयते ।

Ekāvalī VIII. 27.

He also explains the meaning of the term अप्रस्तुत-प्रशंसा, especially of the word प्रशंसा, by saying :—

अत एवाप्रस्तुतस्य प्रशंसा कथनमित्यन्वर्थताश्रयणसामर्थ्याद-प्रस्तुतस्य वाच्यत्वम् ...... ।

Ekāvalī VIII. 27.

The word '*pras'aṁsā*' is employed in the sense of mere statement.

Vidyānātha

Pratāparudrayas'obhūṣaṇa of Vidyānātha, composed between 1300 A. D. and 1325 A. D., also follows Mammaṭa in the general treatment of the figure, for which it gives the following definition :—

अप्रस्तुतस्य कथनात्प्रस्तुतं यत्र गम्यते ।
अप्रस्तुतप्रशंसेयं सारूप्यादिनिबन्धना ॥

Pratāpa. P. 443.

In his gloss upon the above definition Vidyānātha differentiates Aprastutapras'aṁsā from Samāsokti, Anumāna, Paryāyokta and Dhvani, all of which bear some apparent resemblance to the former. Like Vidyādhara he also states that the suggested idea in the Aprastutapras'aṁsā is vācyasiddhyaṅga.

Vidyānātha's illustration of the Sārūpyamūlā is as follows :—

आशासु प्रशमितवासनोदयेभ्यः
किं लब्धं भ्रमरगणैर्जरत्तरुभ्यः ।
पुन्नागो नवनवसौरभप्रसूनै-
रामोदं दिशति निवासमारभध्वम् ॥

Pratāpa. 164.

Like the author of *Ekāvalī*, Vidyānātha also has himself composed illustrations in praise of his patron Pratāparudra. He therefore explains the above illustration as follows :—

अत्र भ्रमरवृत्तान्तेनाप्रस्तुतेन सर्वानसंपूर्णविभवानुर्वीश्वरान् विहाय सकलगुणपरिपूर्णः सर्वजनानन्दी प्रतापरुद्र एक एव सर्वेषां विदुषां सेव्य इति प्रस्तुतं प्रतीयते ।

Pratāpa. p. 444.

At the end of his treatment of the figure Vidyānātha adds that the reader should himself notice other varieties based on the principle of *sambhava* etc ;

वाच्यसंभवासंभवोभयरूपतया यथासंभवं भेदाः स्वयं द्रष्टव्याः ।

Pratāpa. p. 446.

Though the above remark occurs in the text in close contiguity with the treatment of the Kārya-Kāraṇa-nibandhanā variety of the figure, it is evident that it applies to the Sārūpyamūlā. Vidyānātha follows Ruyyaka in this respect.

Vāgbhaṭa II

Vāgbhaṭa, the author of *Kāvyānus'āsana*, probably flourished in the fourteenth century. He admits Anyokti and Aprastutapras'aṁsā as two distinct alaṁkāras. In his treatment of the latter he follows Vāmana, for his definition of the figure is exactly the same as that given by Vāmana, viz.,

उपमेयस्य किंचिदुक्तावप्रस्तुतप्रशंसा ।

Vāg. Kāvyā. P. 36.

The illustration लावण्यसिन्धुरपरैव etc. is also the same. Thus Vāgbhaṭa's conception of Aprastutapras'aṁsā is peculiar like that of Vāmana. He defines Anyokti as follows :—

उपमेयस्यैवोक्तावन्यप्रतीतिरन्योक्तिः ।

Vāg. Kāvyā. P. 35.

Anyokti consists in the apprehension of another, i. e. the upamāna, when only the upameya is expressed. Vāgbhaṭa does not explain his definition. Only he gives four illustrations for four varieties of Anyokti. The first of these varieties is not named by him. The remaining three are described as *nindārūpā*, *stutirūpā* and *ubhayarūpā*. The first illustration, viz.,

न्यग्रोधे फलशालिनि स्फुटरसं किंचित्फलं पच्यते
बीजान्यङ्कुरगोचराणि कतिचित्सिध्यन्ति तस्मिन्नपि।
एकस्तेष्वपि कश्चिदङ्कुरवरो बध्नाति तामुन्नतिं
यामध्वन्यजनः स्वमातरमिव क्लान्तिच्छिदे धावति ॥

Vāg. Kāvyā. P. 35,

is an anyokti which contains neither praise nor censure. It may be therefore described as *anubhayarūpā*. For the ubhayarūpā variety Vāgbhaṭa quotes the same illustration

as Hemacandra, viz., निष्कन्दामरविन्दिनीं etc. The remaining two are illustrated as follows :—

निन्दारूपा यथा—

यत्तद्गर्जितमूर्जितं यदपि च प्रोद्दामसौदामनी–
दामाडम्बरमम्बरे विरचितं यच्चोन्नतं दूरतः ।
तेषां पर्यवसानमीदृशमिदं जातं यदम्भोधर
छिद्राः कृत्रिमरोदनाश्रुतनवो मुक्ताः पयोबिन्दवः ॥

A cloud is here censured for raising very high hopes of rains by its thunders and lightning and then disappointing by dropping only a few drops of water. The ambhodhara-vṛttānta, however, is aprastuta. Through it the poet criticises a person of similar behaviour. How often in our life we come across persons, who raise high expectations about themselves by their promises and boasts and prove in the end to be utterly disappointing !

स्तुतिरूपा यथा—

क्षुत्क्षामोऽपि जराकृशोऽपि शिथिलप्राणोऽपि कष्टां दशा–
मापन्नोऽपि विपन्नदीधितिरपि प्राणेषु गच्छत्स्वपि ।
मत्तेभेन्द्रविशालकुम्भदलनव्यापारबद्धस्पृहः
किं जीर्णं तृणमत्ति मानमहतामग्रेसरः केसरी ॥

Here is a praise for the proud lion which will not stoop to eat rotten grass even if it is starved to death. This suggests the equally lofty conduct of a self-respecting and proud-natured man. This verse is attributed to one Ratisena.

Though all the four illustrations adduced by Vāgbhaṭa are typical anyoktis it is difficult to understand the exact meaning of his definition. The definition states that Anyokti consists in the expression of the Upameya

leading to the apprehension of another, *anya*, i.e. the Upamāna. Vāgbhaṭa does not make it clear as to what is prastuta of the two. Ordinarily it is the Upameya that is prastuta and not the Upamāna. The definition as it stands would rather apply to Samāsokti where the description of a prastuta idea also suggests another similar idea.

Vis'vanātha

Vis'vanātha, who flourished between A. D. 1300 and A. D. 1384, deals with the figures of sense in the last pariccheda of his *Sāhityadarpaṇa*. In Kārikās 58–59 he mentions the varieties of Aprastutapras'aṁsā and defines the fifth and last variety as follows :—

.... अथ समात्समम् ।
अप्रस्तुतात्प्रस्तुतं चेद्गम्यते पञ्चधा ततः ।

Sāhityadarpaṇa X. 59.

Like many of his predecessors Vis'vanātha gives five varieties of this alaṁkāra, based respectively on Sāmānya-vis'eṣa, Kārya-kāraṇa and Sārūpya relations. And also like them he divides the Sārūpyamūlā into three sub-varieties :

तुल्ये प्रस्तुते तुल्याभिधाने च द्विधा श्लेषमूला सादृश्यमात्रमूला च । श्लेषमूलापि समासोक्तिवद् विशेषणमात्रश्लेषे श्लेषवद् विशेष्यस्यापि श्लेषे भवतीति द्विधा ।

Sāhityadarpaṇa X. 59.

Though Vis'vanātha follows Mammaṭa in dividing the Sārūpya type into three varieties, his terminology is better than that of Mammaṭa. In fact he improves upon Mammaṭa by stating s'leṣa and sādṛs'ya as the basis of division. The first variety which is based on s'leṣa has double-meaning adjectives. In this respect it resembles

Samāsokti. Vis'vanātha gives the following stanza illustrate this variety :

सहकारः सदामोदो वसन्तश्रीसमन्वितः ।
समुज्ज्वलरुचिः श्रीमान्प्रभूतोत्कलिकाकुलः ॥

Sāhityadarpaṇa X. 59.

Here is the description of a mango tree ; but it is not the theme of the poem. The description suggests, on account of s'liṣṭa adjectives only, the charms of a loving person who is intended to be described.

Daṇḍin defines one of the varieties of his Samāsokti as follows :—

विशेष्यमात्रभिन्नापि तुल्याकारविशेषणा ।
अस्त्यसौ........................ ॥

Kāvyādars'a 208,

and illustrates it by the stanza

रूढमूलः फलभरैः पुष्णन्ननिशमर्थिनः ।
सान्द्रच्छायो महावृक्षः सोऽयमासादितो मया ॥

Kāvyādars'a 209.

On comparing the above illustration of Samāsokti given by Daṇḍin with Vis'vanātha's illustration of the Sārūpyamūla, already quoted above, we find that they are of the same character. Explaining the import of his illustration Daṇḍin remarks :

(अत्र) पुमान् कश्चिद् वृक्षत्वेनोपवर्णितः ।
सर्वे साधारणा धर्माः ....

Kāvyādars'a. 211.

And commenting on his own illustration Vis'vanātha also says the same thing :

अत्र विशेषणमात्रश्लेषवशाद् अप्रस्तुतात्सहकारात् कस्यचित् प्रस्तुतस्य नायकस्य प्रतीतिः ।

Sāhityadarpaṇa X. 59.

In the section on Bhoja we have already referred to this confusion between Samāsokti and Anyokti, arising from the diverse views held in this regard by different writers.

The second variety based on s'leṣa has all the words, including the vis'eṣya, meaning two things. It resembles therefore, in this respect, the arthālaṁkāra called S'leṣa. Vis'vanātha illustrates this variety by the same stanza as given by Mammaṭa, viz., पुंस्त्वादपि प्रविचलेत् etc. Disagreeing with Hemacandra in the interpretation of this verse he adds :

अत्र पुरुषोत्तमपदेन विशेष्येणापि श्लिष्टेन प्रचुरप्रसिद्ध्या प्रथमं विष्णुरेव बोध्यते। तेन वर्णनीयः कश्चित्पुरुषः प्रतीयते।

Sāhityadarpaṇa X. 59.

For the third variety in which the prastuta is suggested on the strength of mere resemblance Vis'vanātha gives the following illustration :—

एकः कपोतपोतः शतशः श्येनाः क्षुधाभिधावन्ति।
अम्बरमावृतिशून्यं हर हर शरणं विधेः करुणा॥

Sāhityadarpaṇa X. 59.

अत्र कपोतादप्रस्तुतात्कश्चित्प्रस्तुतः प्रतीयते।

Like Ruyyaka Vis'vanātha also admits varieties based on vaidharmya, sambhava, asambhava etc. Towards the end of his treatment of the figure he distinguishes Aprastutapras'aṁsā from Vastudhvani.

Bhānudatta

Bhānudatta, who composed his *Alaṁkāratilaka* between A. D. 1450 and A. D. 1500, admits an alaṁkāra called *Aprastutastotra.* He defines it as follows :—

प्रस्तुतनिष्ठोऽप्रस्तुतप्रस्तावोऽप्रस्तुतस्तोत्रम्।

Alaṁkāratilaka V.

Aprastutastotra is the mention of an aprastuta theme relating to a prastuta one. Generally the definition agrees with that of the normal Aprastutapras'aṁsā. Bhānudatta gives two illustrations both of which are instances of Aprastutapras'aṁsā based on relations other than Sādṛs'ya. For example take the verse

अलसभुजलताभिर्नाहतो नागरीभि-
र्भवनद्रुम(?)कानां नातिथिर्वा बभूव ।
त्वदरिनगरमध्ये संचरंश्चैत्रजन्मा
जरदजगरपीतः क्षीयते गन्धवाहः ॥

Bhānudatta explains the point here by saying :—

प्रस्तुता राजस्तुतिरप्रस्तुतो गन्धवाहः ।

It is clear therefore that he does not contemplate the variety based on Sādṛs'ya. But he distinguishes this figure from Samāsokti by adding :

न च समासोक्तावतिव्याप्तिः । तस्या अन्यापदेशमात्रविषयत्वात् ।

From this it appears that Bhānudatta regards Samāsokti as the same as the normal fifth type of Aprastutapras'aṁsā or Anyokti. His definition of Samāsokti seems to bear this out. He says :—

अभिप्रेतवस्तुनः समानवस्त्वन्तरेणाभिधानं समासोक्तिः ।
एकाभिधाने द्वयोरभिधानमिति समासः ।

Truly speaking, however, Bhanudatta's conception of 'Anyāpades'a' is slightly different. In his Samasokti there is no suggestion of the intended sense. The intended thing is expressed in so many words ; cf.

अभिप्रेतवस्तुनः समानवस्त्वन्तरेण अभिधानम् and एकाभिधाने द्वयोरभिधानम्. In other words along with the similar aprastuta idea the prastuta one is also stated. This is confirmed by the illustration that he adds :

अपहाय सुवर्णकेतकीं भ्रमर प्रस्थितमेव चेत् त्वया ।
न वपुर्न वयो न गुणः पुरुषं रोद्धुमपि प्रवर्तते ॥

Alaṁkāratilaka V.

Kes'ava Mis'ra

The *Alaṁkāras'ekhara* of Kes'ava Mis'ra written in the second half of the sixteenth century defines Samāsokti, which it designates as *anyāpades'a*, as follows :—

अन्यदेवाभिप्रेत्यान्याभिधानं समासोक्तिः । सा चान्यापदेश इत्युच्यते ।

Alaṁkāras'ekhara 13.

Though Kes'ava Mis'ra's definition is acceptable to us as the definition of the normal *anyokti* his illustration cannot be regarded either as an anyokti or as an anyāpades'a as we understand them.

त्वं पीयूष दिवोऽपि भूषणमसि द्राक्षे परीक्षेत को
माधुर्यं तव विश्वतोऽपि विदिता माध्वीक साध्वी कथा ।
एतत्किंतु तवाप्यरुंतुदमिव ब्रूमो न चेत्कुप्यसे
यः कान्ताधरपल्लवे मधुरिमा नान्यत्र कुत्रापि सः ॥

Alaṁkāras'ekhara 13.

Appayya Dīkṣita

In the general treatment of the figures of sense the *Kuvalayānanda* of Appayya Dīkṣita, who flurished between A. D. 1554 and A. D. 1626, follows the Candrāloka of Jayadeva. But while Jayadeva admits only one kind of Aprastutapras'aṁsā Appayya admits the usual five varieties like his well-known predecessors. Of the Sārūpya variety he admits three sub-varieties, viz. those respectively involving *stuti*, *nindā* and simple statement.

एवं च लक्ष्यलक्षणयोः प्रशंसाशब्दः स्तुतिनिन्दा-स्वरूपाख्यानसाधारणकीर्तनमात्रपरो द्रष्टव्यः ।

Kuvalayānanda 66.

For *stutirūpā* variety Appayya gives the same illustration as Jayadeva, viz.,

एकः कृती शकुन्तेषु योऽन्यं शक्रान्न याचते ।,

which has been already discussed in the section on Jayadeva. The *nindārūpā* variety is illustrated by the stanza :

आबद्धकृत्रिमसटाजटिलांसभित्ति-
रारोपितो मृगपतेः पदवीं यदि श्वा ।
मत्तेभकुम्भतटपाटनलम्पटस्य
नादं करिष्यति कथं हरिणाधिपस्य ॥

Commenting on this Appayya says :

अत्र शुनकस्य निन्दा निन्दनीयत्वेन प्रस्तुते तत्सरूपे कृत्रिमवेषव्यवहारादिमात्रेण विद्वत्ताभिनयवति वैधेये पर्यवस्यति ।

The last variety in which there is neither *stuti* nor *nindā* but only the description of a state is illustrated by the stanza

अन्तश्छिद्राणि भूयांसि कण्टका बहवो बहिः ।
कथं कमलनालस्य मा भूवन्भङ्गुरा गुणाः ॥

This has been quoted by Ruyyaka and Vis'vanātha to illustrate that variety of Aprastutapras'aṁsā in which the vācyārtha is both sambhavi and asambhavi.

Like Jayadeva Appayya also admits *Prastutāṅkura* as a distinct alaṁkāra. In addition to the illustration किं भृङ्ग सत्यां मालत्यां केतक्या कण्टकेद्धया । given by Jayadeva Appayya quotes two more stanzas as illustrations of Prastutāṅkura. The first of these is the well-known stanza

अन्यासु तावदुपमर्दसहासु भृङ्ग
लोलं विनोदय मनः सुमनोलतासु ।
बालामजातरजसं कलिकामकाले
व्यर्थं कदर्थयसि किं नवमालिकायाः ॥

As already noted in the section on Bhoja the variant version of the *Abhinavabhāratī* attributes this stanza to Vikaṭanitambā and quotes it as an illustration of the Lakṣaṇa called Manoratha. It is a very fine Anyokti. But Appayya regards it as an illustration of *Prastutāṅkura* because according to him both the bee and the lover are prastuta, are intended to be rebuked by the speaker.

अत्राप्युद्यानमध्ये चरन्तं भृङ्गं प्रत्युपालम्भ इति वाच्यार्थस्यापि प्रस्तुतत्वम् । इदं च प्रौढाङ्गनासु सतीषु बालिकां रतये क्लेशयति कामिनि शृण्वति कस्याश्चिद्विदग्धाया वचनमिति तं प्रत्युपालम्भो द्योत्यते ।

Kuvalayānanda 67.

The second stanza quoted by Appayya as an alternative illustration of Prastutāṅkura is as follows :—

कोशद्वन्द्वमियं दधाति नलिनी कादम्बचञ्चुक्षतं
धत्ते चूतलता नवं किसलयं पुंस्कोकिलास्वादितम् ।
इत्याकर्ण्य मिथः सखीजनवचः सा दीर्घिकायास्तटे
चैलान्तेन तिरोदधे स्तनतटं बिम्बाधरं पाणिना ॥

Here, as Appayya argues, the lotus plant and the mango tree are prastuta though they are described by the speaker. But at the same time the description suggests the condition of a lady who bears the marks of love sport on her person and who is prastuta, she being also intended to be described by the speaker. However in the latter part of the stanza the poet himself expresses the suggested idea in so many words.

अत्रेयमिति नलिनीव्यक्तिविशेषनिर्देशेन दीर्घिकायास्तटे इत्यनेन च वाच्यार्थस्य प्रस्तुतत्वं स्पष्टम् । प्रस्तुतान्तरद्योतनं चोत्तरार्धे स्वयमेव कविनाविष्कृतम् ।

Appayya thereafter discusses the question of the distinction between the Aprastutapras'aṁsā alaṁkāra and Dhvani by quoting the views of Abhinavagupta and Ānandavardhana.

Jagannātha

Jagannātha, the author of *Rasagaṁgādhara* which was composed between A. D. 1641 and A. D. 1650, defines Aprastutapras'aṁsā as follows:

अप्रस्तुतेन व्यवहारेण सादृश्यादिवक्ष्यमाणप्रकारान्यतमप्रकारेण प्रस्तुतव्यवहारो यत्र प्रशस्यते साऽप्रस्तुतप्रशंसा ।

Rasagaṁgādhara P. 537.

The Aprastutapras'aṁsā consists in the description of an aprastuta object or idea leading to the apprehension of the prastuta one through sādṛs'ya or any other mode. Jagannātha makes it clear at the outset that the figure is exactly the reverse of Samāsokti.

अप्रस्तुतेन गम्येन वाच्यस्य प्रस्तुतस्योपस्करणे समासोक्तिरुक्ता । तद्वैपरीत्येनाप्रस्तुतप्रशंसोच्यते ।

Rasagaṁgādhara P. 537.

Obviously Jagannātha has the Sādṛs'yamūlā variety in his mind when he distinguishes it from the Samāsokti. It is needless to state that he takes the word प्रशंसा in the definition to mean mere description.

प्रशंसनं च वर्णनमात्रम्, न तु स्तुतिः ।

Jagannātha accepts the five main varieties of the figure, but he gives the Sādṛs'yamūlā the first place in his enumeration.

अप्रस्तुतेन स्वसदृशं गम्यते यस्यामित्येका ।

He illustrates it by giving three examples, two of which are very well known as beautiful Anyoktis:

दिगन्ते श्रूयन्ते मदमलिनगण्डाः करटिनः
करिण्यः कारुण्यास्पदमसमशीलाः खलु मृगाः।
इदानीं लोकेऽस्मिन्ननुपमशिखानां पुनरयं
नखानां पाण्डित्यं प्रकटयतु कस्मिन्मृगपतिः ॥

Rasagaṁgādhara P. 537.

The mighty elephants are away; their females deserve pity; the deer are unworthy to fight with. Against whom should the lordly lion display the strength of its powerful claws? And

पुरा सरसि मानसे विकचसारसालिस्खल-
त्परागसुरभीकृते पयसि यस्य यातं वयः।
स पल्वलजलेऽधुना मिलदनेकभेकाकुले
मरालकुलनायकः कथय रे कथं वर्तताम् ॥

Having lived in the fragrant waters of the Mānasa lake beautified with lines of lotuses the swan now feels extremely uncomfortable to mix with frogs in the dirty water of a pool by the side of a road!

Jagannātha also contemplates a variety of the Sādṛs'yamūlā in which the adjectives qualifying the aprastuta are s'liṣṭa:

श्लिष्टविशेषणाप्येषा दृश्यते—
नितरां नीचोऽस्मीति त्वं खेदं कूप मा कदापि कृथाः।
अत्यन्तसरसहृदयो यतः परेषां गुणग्रहीतासि ॥

Rasagaṁgādhara P. 538.

No doubt this variety corresponds to the '*samāsokti-mūlā*' variety of Mammaṭa. But, as already noted in the section on Mammaṭa, Jagannātha disapproves of the view that Samāsokti is the basis for this variety.

Samāsokti is the very antithesis of Sādṛs'yamūlā and hence it can never be the basis for the latter.

समासोक्तिरत्रानुग्राहिकेति तु न वक्तव्यम् । तस्याः प्रकृतालङ्कारविरुद्धात्मिकात्वेनानुग्राहिकात्वायोगात् ।

Rasagaṁgādhara P. 538.

Like Ānandavardhana and Mammaṭa Jagannātha admits cases of Sādṛs'yamūlā in which there is necessity of superimposing the *pratīyamānārtha* on the vācyārtha :

अस्यां च वाक्यार्थः क्वचित्प्रतीयमानार्थताटस्थ्येनैवावतिष्ठते—यथोक्तोदाहरणेषु । क्वचिच्च स्वगतविशेषणान्वययोग्यतामासादयितुं प्रतीयमानाभेदमपेक्षते । यथा—

समुपागतवति दैवादवहेलां कुटज मधुकरे मा गाः ।
मकरन्दतुन्दिलानामरविन्दानामयं महामान्यः ॥

यथा वा—

तावत्कोकिल दिवसान्यापय विरसान्वनान्तरे निवसन् ।
यावन्मिलदलिमालः कोऽपि रसालः समुल्लसति ॥

Rasagaṁgādhara P. 539.

In the two instances given above the tree and the bird respectively are addressed. But as Jagannātha observes it is absurd to address them. Hence there is the necessity of identifying the suggested sense with the expressed sense to render the description plausible. It is interesting to note that though the principle underlying this distinction is the same it is differently designated by different writers. Ānandavardhana understands it as the *vivakṣā* of the vācyārtha ; Mammaṭa designates it as the *adhyāropa* of the pratīyamānārtha ; Ruyyaka describes it as the *sambhavāsambhava* of the vācyārtha ; while Jagannātha names it as *abheda* or tādātmya.

In the two instances just quoted the identification of the suggested idea with the expressed one is only partial, i. e. only in respect of the *vis'eṣyas.* This may be wholly, i. e. in respect of both the vis'eṣya and the vis'eṣaṇa as illustrated in the stanza :

मलिनेऽपि रागपूर्णां विकसितवदनामनल्पजल्पेऽपि ।
त्वयि चपलेऽपि च सरसां भ्रमर कथं वा सरोजिनीं त्यजसि ॥

In the above illustration a bee is rebuked for abandoning the lotus-plant though the latter is full of love for it. Jagannātha argues that in the present case the identification between the vācyārtha and the pratīyamānārtha is in respect of both the vis'eṣya and the vis'eṣaṇa.

अत्र त्यागानौचित्यहेतुत्वेन कमलिन्याः स्तुतिरूपं विशेषण-मुपात्तम् । तच्च न संभवति । नहि भ्रमरे श्यामत्वादिर्दोषः, कमलिन्याः शोणत्वादिर्वा गुणः, येन स्तुतिः स्यात् । अतो वाच्यार्थस्य प्रतीयमानतादात्म्यं विशेष्यांशे विशेषणांशे चापेक्ष्यते ।

Rasagaṁgādhara P. 539.

With reference to this illustration Jagannātha makes subsequently an interesting observation. He states that the Sādṛs'yamūlā variety may be of many kinds, one of which is of course the normal type in which an aprastuta vācya leads to the suggestion of the prastuta.

वस्तुतस्तु प्रथमस्याप्रस्तुतप्रशंसाप्रकारस्य नानाविधत्वं संभवति। यत्रात्यन्तमप्रस्तुतेन वाच्येन प्रस्तुतं गम्यते स प्रकारो निगदित एव ।

But in special circumstances both the ideas may be *prastuta* and yet the case may be that of Aprastuta-pras'aṁsā, as illustrated in the stanza मलिनेऽपि रागपूर्णां etc.

यत्र च स्थलविशेषे वृत्तान्तद्वयमपि प्रस्तुतं सोऽप्येकः (प्रकारः)। यथा जलक्रीडाप्रकरणे भ्रमरकमलिन्यादिषु पुरःस्थितेषु, नायके च स्वनायिकायामननुरक्ते पार्श्ववर्तिनि, नायिकासख्याः कस्याश्चिदुक्तौ मलिनेऽपि रागपूर्णामित्यादिप्रागुदाहृते पद्ये।

Rasagaṁgādhara P. 542.

Such an attitude may be objected to on the ground that in that case the stanza will cease to be an instance of Aprastutapras'amsā inasmuch as the vācyārtha is not aprastuta.

Jagnnātha meets this argument by simply stating

अप्रस्तुतशब्देन हि मुख्यतात्पर्यविषयीभूतार्थातिरिक्तोऽर्थो विवक्षितः। स च क्वचिदत्यन्ताप्रस्तुतः, क्वचित्प्रस्तुतश्च इति न कोऽपि दोषः।

Rasagaṁgādhara P. 542.

On the basis of this argument, which may not be entirely acceptable, Jagannātha rejects the view of Appayya that there is a distinct alaṁkāra called Prastutāṅkura in such cases.

एतेन द्वयोः प्रस्तुतत्वे प्रतुस्ताङ्कुरनामान्योऽलंकारः इति कुवलयानन्दाद्युक्तमुपेक्षणीयम्।

Rasagaṁgādhara P. 542.

Dhvani and Aprastutapras'aṁsā

Ānandavardhana

यदा तु सारूप्यमात्रवशेनाप्रस्तुतप्रशंसायामप्रकृतप्रकृतयोः सम्बन्धस्तदाप्यप्रस्तुतय सरूपस्याभिधीस्यमानस्य प्राधान्येनाविवक्षायां ध्वनावेवान्तःपातः। इतरथा त्वलङ्कारान्तरमेव।

Dhvanyāloka I. 13

Abhinavagupta

अप्रस्तुतात्कदाचिद्वाच्याच्चमत्कारः, व्यङ्ग्यं तु तन्मुखप्रेक्षम् ।... ...यद्यपि सारूप्यवशेन कश्चिदन्यः प्रस्तुत आक्षिप्यते तथाप्य-प्रस्तुतस्यैव...चमत्कारकारित्वम् । नह्यचेतनोपालम्भवदसंभाव्यमानोऽय-मर्थो न च (न) हृद्य इति वाच्यस्य...प्रधानता । यदि पुनरचेतना-दिनात्यन्तासंभाव्यमानतदर्थविशेषणेनाप्रस्तुतेन वर्णितेन प्रस्तुतमाक्षि-प्यमाणं चमत्कारकारि तदा वस्तुध्वनिरसौ ।

Locana P. 51.

अप्रस्तुतप्रशंसाध्वनिरपि—

ढण्ढुल्लन्तो मरिहिसि कण्टअकलिआइँ केअइवणाइं ।
मालइकुसुमसरिच्छं भमर भमन्तो ण पाविहिसि ।।

अत्र प्रियतमेन साकमुद्याने विहरन्ती काचिन्नायिका भ्रमरमेवमाहेति भृङ्गस्याभिधायां प्रस्तुतत्वमेव । न चामन्त्रणादप्रस्तुतप्रशंसा । समा-प्तायां पुनरभिधायां वाच्यार्थबलादन्यापदेशता ध्वन्यते ।

Locana P. 142.

Appayya Dīkṣita

......अन्यापदेशध्वनिमाह लोचनकारः । अप्रस्तुतप्रशंसायां वाच्यार्थोऽप्रस्तुत्वादवर्णनीय इति । तत्राभिधायामपर्यवसितायां तेन प्रस्तुतार्थव्यक्तिरलंकारः । ...वाच्यस्य प्रस्तुतत्वेन तत्राभिधायां पर्यव-सितायामर्थसौन्दर्यबलेनाभिमतार्थव्यक्तिर्ध्वनिरेवेति । वस्तुतस्तु अय-मप्यलंकार एव ध्वनिरिति व्यवस्थापितं चित्रमीमांसायाम् ।

Kuvalayānanda 67.

Jagannātha

अप्रस्तुतशब्देन हि मुख्यतात्पर्यविषयीभूतार्थातिरिक्तोऽर्थो विवक्षितः । स च क्वचिदत्यन्ताप्रस्तुतः क्वचित्प्रस्तुतश्च... । न च ध्वनिमात्रस्याप्रस्तुतप्रशंसात्वापत्तिरिति वाच्यम् । अत एव तत्र सादृश्याद्यन्यतमप्रकारेणेति विशेषणमुपात्तमिति विभावनीयम् ।

Rasagaṁgādhara P. 542.

अत्यन्ताप्रस्तुतस्य वाच्यतायां तस्मिन्नपर्यवसिततया अभिधया प्रतीयमानार्थस्य बलादाकृष्टत्वेन ध्वनित्वं न निर्बाधम्। द्वयोः प्रस्तुतत्वे तु ध्वनित्वं निर्विवादमेव। एवं सादृश्यमूलप्रकारे द्वैतम्। कार्यकारणभाव---सामान्यविशेषभावमूलास्तु चत्वारः प्रकारा गुणीभूतव्यङ्ग्यस्यैव भेदाः। अभिधादिस्पर्शलेशशून्यस्य केवलागूरणमात्रस्य ध्वनित्वप्रयोजकत्वात्।

Rasagaṁgādhara P. 543.

II. The Anyoktistabaka

1. *Manuscript Material*

The text of the *Anyoktistabaka* of Vaṁs'īdhara Mis'ra is edited here with the help of an only Ms. in the possession of the M. T. B. College Library, College-nagar, Surat. The Ms. bears the serial number 544 and consists of 10 folios of old country paper. There are 12–13 lines on each folio and each line contains about 25 letters. The size of the Ms. is 8" by 4.7". A margin of about .5″ is left on both the sides ruled by double black lines. The work begins on folio 1b. It is torn at the lower left hand corner and hence the text is slightly damaged. The upper corner bears the title of the work indicated by अ० क्ति०. The word राम० appears at the lower right hand corner on every numbered page. The characters are Devanagari with the following peculiarities :

(i) बु is invariably written as ॱ.

(ii) ष् is frequently written in place of ख्.

(iii) र् is peculiarly written as ⊣.

(iv) अ is written as ञ्र.

The Ms. is legible but there are a few scribal errors. Another peculiarity of the Ms. is that it frequently

introduces Yamas ; e. g. मार्तण्ड is written as मार्त्तण्ड, जर्जरस्य is written as जर्ज्जरस्य etc.

The scribe's name is given as Buddhis'armā Mis'ra. The date of copying the Ms. is Saṁvat 1727 which corresponds to 1671 A. D.

The Ms. begins as follows :—

पुनातु जानकीपाणिग्राही भरतपूर्वजः ।
सनाथमिषुभिस्तूणमाददान इव स्मरः ॥ १

It ends on folio 10 a :

यत्किंचिदत्र मोहेन प्रबद्धमसमंजसं ।
संख्यावद्भिरसंख्यातगुणैः कार्यं समंजसं ॥ १०४ ॥

The colophon reads as follows :—

इति श्रीवंशीधरमिश्रकृतोयमन्योक्तिस्तबकः ॥ ॥ छ संवत् १७२७ समये ज्येष्ठे मासि कृष्णपक्षे त्रयोदशीशनिवासरे कौलिखितमिदं पुस्तक मिश्रबुद्धिशर्मणा परस्वार्थं च ॥ ॥ छ ॥ ॥ श्री ॥
॥ कल्याणमस्तू ॥ ॥ शुभं भूयात् ॥ छ ॥ ॥

2. *Vaṁs'īdhara Mis'ra*

The author of the *Anyoktistabaka* is one Vaṁs'īdhara Mis'ra about whom nothing definite is known. The catalogues of Sanskrit manuscripts record a number of persons bearing the name of Vaṁsa'dhara or Vaṁs'īdhara. For example the *Catalogus Catalogorum* of Aufrecht records

(1) Vaṁs'adhara Mis'ra, son of Gokulanātha and nephew of Jagannātha, who wrote three works, viz. *Ānvīkṣikī* or *Nyāyatatvaparīkṣā*, a commentary on the Nyāyasūtras of Gautama, *Yogaruḍhīvicāra* and *Vidhivādanyāya* ;

(2) A Vaṁs'īdhara S'armā, father of Nārāyaṇa S'armā and grandfather of Lakṣmīnātha S'armā, who wrote a commentary on the *S'is'upālavadha* of Māgha;

(3) A Vaṁs'īdhara, father of Vidyāpati, author of a work called *Vaidyarahasyapaddhati*, whose probable date is given as 1682 A. D.

(4) A Vaṁs'īdhara, author of *Kucakaṅḍikā* and *Homavidhi.*

(5) A Vaṁs'īdhara, author of a commentary on the *Chandomanjarī* and the *Piṅgalaprakās'a.*

(6) A Vaṁs'īdhara, author of *Vaṁs'īdharī*, a commentary on the *Tatvakaumudī* of Vācaspati Mis'ra and of the *S'abdaprāmāṇyakhaṇḍana.*

(7) Vaṁs'īdhara Daivajña, author of an astrological work called *Daivajñakalānidhi*;

(8) A Vams'īdhara, author of two works on Āyurveda, viz., the *Vaidyakutūhala* and the *Vaidyamana-utsava*;

(9) A Vaṁs'īdhara, author of *Karmamañjarī* and

(10) A Vaṁs'īdhara, who was a scribe belonging to the third quarter of the 17th century A. D.

Another scribe of the same name is assigned to 1754 A. D. Still another scribe, called Vaṁs'īdhara Tripāṭhī, is assigned to the beginning of the 17th century A. D.

It is difficult to say which one of the Vaṁs'īdharas enumerated above was the author of the present work. The problem is rendered still more difficult by the circumstance that the work *Anyoktistabaka* seems to have been unknown so far. Neither the old *Cat. Cat.* of

Aufrecht nor the new one prepared by Dr. Raghavan seems to be aware of it.

Beside the *Anyoktistabaka*, Vaṁs'īdhara Mis'ra wrote another work called *Rājapras'aṁsāstabaka*. The Ms. of the *Rājapras'aṁsāstabaka* is also in the possession of the M. T. B. College Library. The colophon of this Ms. like that of the Ms. of the *Anyoktistabaka* records the same name Vaṁs'idhara Mis'ra as its author and the scribe too is the same Buddhis'armā Mis'ra. Moreover the date of copying the two Mss. is also the same, i. e. Saṁvat 1727.

In the *Rājapras'aṁsāstabaka* Vaṁs'idhara Mis'ra eulogizes a king who is variously referred to as Rāma, Rāmacandra, Rāmabhadra, and Ādirāja. The *Rājapras'-aṁsāstabaka* as its name suggests is an eulogy of a king called Rāma who may be supposed to have patronised the poet. It is however difficult to determine the identity of this king Rāma.

Only three stanzas from the *Anyoktistabaka* are found in the *Subhāṣitaratnabhāṇḍāgāra* published by the Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay. But the latter work does not indicate their sources. In all likelihood these three stanzas belong originally to Vaṁs'īdhara for there is no reason to believe that Vaṁs'īdhara knew of them from some earlier source and included them in his collection along with others of his own composition.

अथ वंशीधरमिश्रविरचितः

अन्योक्तिस्तबकः।

१.

पुनातु जानकीपाणिग्राही भरतपूर्वजः।
सनाथमिषुभिस्तूणमाददान इव स्मरः॥

२.

यस्य त्रीणि जगन्ति काचन कला यः प्राणिनामन्तरा
तारालोचनगोलकेष्विव सदा सारायितं तिष्ठति।
सर्वार्थप्रतिभूः समस्तजगतामेको यदिच्छालव-
स्तस्मै प्राक्तनपूरुषाय परमानन्दाय नित्यं नमः॥

३.

अपि प्रभूतं विदुषां मतिभ्यो
महाखनिभ्यः खलु काव्यरत्नम्।
सभासु सञ्चारितमुत्तमाना-
मनर्घ्यतामञ्चति मञ्जुतां च॥

४.

जडसङ्गेऽपि न लिप्ताः श्रीसद्भावेऽपि नोत्तरलाः।
अम्भोजकोरका इव विज्ञा [1]विकसन्ति विश्वस्मै॥

---

१. विकशंति।

५.

सज्जनश्रवणगामिनी परं
ग्राम्यगीरपि सुभाषितायते ।
मौक्तिकीभवति शुक्तिसम्पुटे
सन्निविष्टमुदकं तडिद्गतः ॥

६.

वस्तु किञ्चिदपि कान्तिसौष्ठवं
योग्य एव निहितं नियच्छति ।
आहितः सुललितेऽपि लोचने
जातु यावकरसो न राजते ॥

७.

वाचालतामाचरतो मनुष्या-
न्मन्ये महार्घो मितभारतीकः ।
झङ्कारिझञ्झापवनादमन्दं
मन्दानिलः संमदमातनोति ॥

८. मलयानिलः ।

सन्तापं तिरयन्व . . लुकयन्पर्यन्तमामोदयन्
हृद्यं मार्दवमुद्वहन्नुपगतः प्रेयानिव . . से ।
शृङ्गारप्रतिपत्तिपण्डितसखे श्रीखण्डशैलानिल
त्वं दृश्येषु न कल्पितः [१]कुविधिना किं किं न वाम्यं कृतम् ॥

---

१. कुविना ।

९. मेघः ।

उद्ग्रीवमुन्नमितलोचनपक्ष्मपालि
रोमाञ्चशालिसकलाङ्कमुत्सवेन ।
सन्तापशीर्णतनवस्तृषिताः [1]श्रमार्ताः
के के न वारिद भवन्तमिहार्थयन्ते ॥

१०. मेघः ।

विष्वग्विष्णुपदं रुणत्सि कुरुषे पन्थानमत्याविलं
रोद्धुं धावसि मित्रमण्डलमपि [2]ध्वान्तैर्दिशो लुम्पसि ।
आरावैरभितस्तनोषि बधिरीभावं जनानां घन
श्लाघ्योऽसि त्वमथाऽपि चेत्किमपरं पुण्यैर्यशो लभ्यते ॥

११. चन्द्रः ।

[3]मार्तण्डेन महौजसा परिभवं नीतोऽस्मि नित्यं हठा-
दित्यालोच्य तदन्वये मयि शिशौ शीर्णोत्सवे सम्प्रति ।
[4]कर्तुं किञ्चिदसाम्प्रतं यदनलक्रूरैः करैः क्रीडसि
त्वं पीयूषमयूख [5]नूनमसमं कर्मेदमाकाङ्क्षसि ॥

१२. चन्द्रः ।

यः [6]सूर्यातपजर्जरस्य जगतः स्वास्थ्यक्रियाकर्मठः
शश्वत्कुड्मलिताननस्य कुमुदग्रामस्य वैहासिकः ।
चन्द्रः सोऽयमितोऽपि चक्रपरिषत्तापं समालम्बते
को वामस्य विधेरिह व्यवसितं विज्ञातुमीशो जनः ॥

---

१. श्रमार्त्ताः । २. ध्वातैः । ३. मार्त्तण्डेन । ४. कर्त्तुम् । ५. नूनूम.
६. ०जर्ज्जरस्य ।

१३. भ्रमरः ।

[1]समन्तादुन्मीलन्नवमुकुलमाले रसमये
रसाले रागान्धीकृतपरभृते सत्यपि पुनः ।
असौ [2]माध्वीकाशामुषितमतिपुञ्जो मधुकरः
स्वदोषाय स्वैरं कुरबकवनान्ते विहरति ॥

१४. आम्रः ।

मधुच्छन्ना [3]मूर्तिः परिमलपरिष्वङ्गसुभगा
वनाभोगा भृङ्गध्वनितककुभः शेखरभुवः ।
रसाल श्लाघ्यं ते किमिह न कथञ्चिद्भवति चे-
द्विवेकः सम्प्राप्ते बलिभुजि पिके च प्रवचसि ॥

१५. किरातः ।

त्वं सामान्यतरुभ्रमेण सकलक्षोणीरुहक्ष्मापतौ
माकन्देऽपि किरात पातय मुधा मास्मिन्कुठारं हठात् ।
एष श्लाघ्यजनस्य जीवितमलिव्यूहस्य बन्धुर्मधोः
सर्वस्वं मकरध्वजस्य विजयामात्यः पिकानां गुरुः ॥

१६. आम्रः ।

कर्णालङ्करणोचितैः [4]किसलयैरेणीदृशः कोरकै-
रुद्यद्भिः पिकमण्डलीमधुकरश्रेणीमधुश्रेणिभिः ।
आनीता जनता [5]फलैः परिणतैरुल्लाससमेतावता
माकन्दद्रुम दानपाटवमिदं कुत्रत्यमासादितम् ॥

---

१. समंताद्‌०। २. ०कासामुखित० ३. मूर्त्तिः । ४. किशलयै० । ५. फलै ।

१७. आम्रः ।

चूत निसर्गोदारं फलसम्भारं यथा यथा वहसि ।
विनमसि तथा तथा तत्किमद्भुतं ते कुलीनस्य ॥

१८. कासारः ।

कोलैः कर्दमितोऽसि मत्तमहिषैरान्दोलितोऽसि द्विपै–
राक्रान्तोऽसि कदर्थितोऽसि बहुशो [1]दुष्पीवरैर्धीवरैः ।
त्वं कासार तथापि मानसमहीसञ्चारिणां पक्षिणा–
मक्ष्णोः कञ्चिदरोचकामयमपाकर्तुं[2] कृती कथ्यसे ॥

१९. राजहंसः ।

आस्तामाकृतिवर्णनं विजयतां वंशक्रमो [3]वर्ततां
वैदग्धी विपुलायतां गुणगणस्तैस्तैरुपायैस्तव ।
किं ब्रूमो बहु राजहंस भवसि त्वं [4]तावदग्राम्यया
गत्या केवलयैव कोविदसभासम्भावनाभाजनम् ॥

२०. हंसः ।

वेश्म ब्रह्मसभैव ते सहचरी वागीश्वरी विज्ञता
नीरक्षीरविवेचनं विमलता लोकप्रसिद्धो गुणः ।
त्वं चेन्मुग्धमराल पङ्क्तिनि बकव्यालोड्यमाने तटे
तुच्छायाः सरितो निषीदसि ननु प्रौढाः खलानां गिरः ॥

---

१. दुःपीवरैः० । २. कर्त्तुं । ३. वर्त्ततां । ४. तावतग्राम्यया ।

२१. हंसः ।

एषा पुष्करिणी मराल मलिनैश्छन्ना[१] कुत्रीथीजलै-
रस्यामज्ञतया विधेरकृपया चेद्वस्तुमाकाङ्क्षसि ।
विश्रम्भो बकमण्डलेषु विनयो भेकेषु संबन्धिता
शम्बूकेषु विधीयतां कृपणता कोयष्टिकश्रेणिषु ॥

२२. हंसः ।

आलोकयन्तः परितो विशाला
दिगन्तमाला नमदभ्रजालाः ।
विमुक्तपङ्केरुहचक्रवाला
गलन्मृणाला मुमुहुर्मरालाः ॥

२३. मयूरः ।

समन्तादाक्रान्ता दवदहनसङ्घैः शिखरिणः
किरातैराकीर्णाः करकलितकाण्डैर्वनभुवः ।
बिडालैरालीढाः सपदि सरसीनां परिसराः
शिखण्डी पाण्डित्यं निजमहह कुत्र प्रथयतु ॥

२४. चक्रवाकः ।

दिवसावसानवेला यथा यथा सविधमुपयाति ।
अपयाति जीविताशा तथा तथा चक्रवाकस्य ॥

---

१. मलिनैःछन्ना ।

२५. चक्रवाकः ।

तामेव दुरितवेलां चिन्तयतश्चक्रवाकस्य ।
हृदयादहह न विरमति विरहः कान्तासमीपेऽपि ॥

२६. काकः ।

मौखर्यमाचरसि यत्किल राजहंस-
मुद्दिश्य तत्तव कुलोचितमेव काक ।
तेनापि यत्सपदि मुद्रणमेव वाचा-
मारब्धमेतदपि किं न कुलानुरूपम् ॥

२७. कोकिलः ।

चैत्ये नित्यनिविष्टवायसकुलक्रेङ्कारझङ्कारिणि
त्वं तावत्परपुष्ट पण्डितसखे मा तुण्डमुद्घाटय ।
पश्य क्रूरकदर्थनाशतपरिश्रान्तश्रुतिश्रेणयः
सन्तापं सुधियोऽपि हन्त गमिताः कस्ते गिरं ज्ञास्यति ॥

२८. कोकिलः ।

[1]मलयजवनीबन्धौ वाते [2]बिभर्ति न सौहृदं
दशति न मधुच्छन्नामग्रे रसालतरोः शिखाम् ।
किरति न सुधासिक्तां वाणीं वियुक्तसुहृज्जनः
परभृतयुवा कुञ्जे कुञ्जे निषीदति निर्मनाः ॥

१. मलजवनी०। २. बिभर्त्ति ।

२९. कपोती:।

नीडे [1]निष्पतति द्रुमेषु दिशति प्रेमाकुले लोचने
दिक्षु भ्राम्यति कोटरेषु विशति व्योमाङ्गने धावति।
व्यामोहं व्रजति क्षणं न सहते शून्यं जगन्मण्डलं
जानीते दयितं विना न वहति प्रीतिं कपोती क्वचित्॥

३०. भ्रमर:।

रन्ता हन्त प्रकृतिमधुरे मालति त्वद्विधानां
रम्यो बन्धुर्बिसिनि विपुलश्रीगभीरे भवत्याः।
हा धिग्दैवं कतिपयदिनैः [2]कश्चिदाविष्करोति
प्रेमाबन्धं मधुकरयुवा यूथिकावीथिकासु॥

३१. भ्रमर:।

कण्टकक्षतिरपेक्षिते पदे
काङ्क्षते मधुनि पांशुराशय:।
किञ्च लोचनसुखं न केतके
किं विलोक्य रमते मधुव्रत:॥

३२. व्याध:।

दानक्षालितगण्डपालिविहरन्मत्तालिवाचालित-
व्योम्नि व्याध वनद्विपे विषशरक्षेप: क्षणं वार्यताम्।
पश्यैते शिखिनः पयोधरधिया धूतस्वकीयच्छद-
च्छत्रच्छन्नमरण्यमेव सकलं नृत्यैरलङ्कुर्वते॥

---

१. नि:पतति।   २. ०दावि:करोति।

३३. करिणी ।

पीतोच्छिष्टं पिबसि सलिलं भुक्तमुक्तं प्रियेण
प्रेम्णा दत्तं सरसबिसिनीभङ्गमङ्गीकरोषि ।
कण्डूकाले नयसि नितरामङ्गभङ्गं तदीयं
नो जानीमः करिणि कियतः [1]पुण्यपुञ्जानकार्षीः ॥

३४. करी ।

धुनोति विधुरं शिरो हरति हन्त हस्तं हठान्
न यच्छति पदं पुरः पतति कातरं क्रन्दति ।
तथा न गणयत्यपि [2]प्रखरमानमाधोरणं
स कोऽपि करिपुङ्गवः कपटसिंहशङ्काकुलः ॥

३५. करी ।

धुनीते मूर्धानं मुखरमभितो धावति करं
क्षिपत्युच्चैर्भूयो विलिखति रदाभ्यामपि नभः ।
न जानीते किञ्च प्रियसहचरीमन्तिकचरीं
करीति [3]क्रोधान्धो नवजलधरे सिन्धुरपतिः ॥

३६. सिंहः ।

जम्बुके रटति रूक्षमुच्चकै-
रीक्षतेऽपि न हरिर्न सा क्षतिः ।
किन्तु कुञ्जरकुलप्रमाथिन-
स्तत्र कोपकलनैव हि क्षतिः ॥

---

१. ०पुंजांनकार्षीः ।   २. प्रखत ।   ३. क्रोधांधो।

३७. मृगी ।

पूर्वं पत्या सह परिचयं प्रापितेषु स्थलेषु
स्थित्वा स्थित्वा नियमितमुखी सर्वतो दिङ्मुखेषु ।
स्मारं स्मारं सरसमसकृत्तं तमिच्छाविहारं
भूयो भूयः कथमपि मृगी लोचनाम्भो रुणद्धि ॥

३८. मृगी ।

स्पृशति न सरसीषु स्वादुतोयं तृणेषु
स्थगयति नयनान्तं नापि नव्याङ्कुरेषु ।
प्रतिपदमधिकोद्यत्कन्धरं कान्तहेतोः
कति कति न कुरङ्गी गाहते काननानि ॥

३९. मृगः ।

अनुपनतनिमेषं चक्षुषा [१]वीक्षमाणः
प्रणयिजनसनाथं दिग्विभागं तमेव ।
लिखित इव कुरङ्गः क्वापि धत्ते न रागं
नयनसलिलधाराधोरणीधौतकायः ॥

४०. युवती ।

सञ्चारोऽसौ विषमतटिनीतीरतो धीवरीणां
यच्छन्तीनामहह चरणान्विक्रमेण क्रमेण ।
त्वं लीलायामपि न सहसे लङ्घनं देहलीनां
नायं पन्थाः पृथुलजघने यानयोग्यो भवत्याः ॥

---

१. वीक्षमानः ।

४१. युवती ।

अनेकलीलामयमक्षिपद्मं
　विलासिनी साहजिकं [1]विधत्तां ।
कुनागरीलोचनयोः प्रयासं
　निजोपहासाय किमातनोति ॥

४२.

यत्र पामरकुटुम्बिनीकथा-
　मात्रमेव मदनस्य जीवितम् ।
तत्र कः कुलवधूविलोकिते
　हन्त हारिणि कुतूहलग्रहः ॥

४३. चन्दनवृक्षः ।

गुरूकरोषि प्रसभं गिरीन्द्रं
　दिशः स्वभावैः सुरभीकरोषि ।
कस्योपदेशेन पुनः पटीर-
　द्रुम द्विजिह्वान् न तिरस्करोषि ॥

४४. कमलम् ।

पङ्कोद्भवं न च विमर्दसहं सदैव
　शैवालजालसहवासविडम्बितं च ।
इन्दीवरं दिनकरेण महाशयेन
　सम्भावितं भवति भाजनमिन्दिरायाः ॥

---

१. विधत्ता ।

४५. लोचनम् ।

अतिलोलतयैव लोचन [1]श्रुतिमुल्लङ्घितुमुद्यतस्य ते ।
मलिनान्तर पापमुद्दितो वचनीयं परपीडनं कियत् ॥

४६. तमस् ।

संरुद्धेव गतिर्जनस्य जगती गीर्णेव विश्वोपरि
व्योमानीव निपातितानि हरितामुन्मूलितेव स्थितिः ।
सम्प्राप्ते भुवनान्तरं दिनकरे देवे दृशां दस्युना
दुर्भासा तमसा निपत्य सहसा किं किं न वाम्यं कृतम् ॥

४७.

यान्येव दुर्मतीनामसतां साहजिकचरितानि ।
तान्येव सज्जनानां निकृत्तमर्माणि कर्माणि ॥

४८.

परमहिमप्रस्तावो दुर्जनमुखमुद्रणोपायः ।
प्रायः स एव महतां मुखमुद्राविघटनोपायः ॥

४९. असज्जनः ।

[2]सरलः शर इव पुरतः प्रणतिप्रवणः कुठार इव ।
परपीडनाय गुणवानसज्जनश्चापदण्ड इव ॥

---

१. उल्लङ्घितु० । २. शरलः ।

५०. तीर्थराजः ।

द्राङ्मालिन्यमपाकृतं समुचितं नैर्मल्यमुद्भावितं
दत्तं गौरवमर्जिता सुकृतिनां वृन्देषु वन्द्या स्थितिः ।
... कुटुम्बितापि जनिता कामं कदम्बैः श्रियां
स श्लाघ्यस्तव तीर्थराज महिमा लोकेषु लोकोत्तरः ।।

५१. चन्द्रिका ।

कामं कैरवमण्डली मलिनतामालम्ब्य [1]वर्तिष्यते
किञ्च प्रेमचला चकोरपरिषत्पण्डोद्यमा यास्यति ।
आनन्दप्रतिपत्तयोऽपि सरितापत्युः समाप्तिं गता—
स्त्वं चेदुज्झसि चन्द्रिके चुलुकिताः सर्वे विशेषाः विधोः ।।

५२. मालाकारः ।

सर्वोद्यानप्रक्रियापण्डितोऽसि
भ्रातः कोपं मा मदुक्तौ [2]विदध्याः ।
वक्ति प्रज्ञादोषमेष त्वदीयं
जातिस्थाने यूथिकासन्निवेशः ।।

५३. मालती ।

नवकोरकाभिरामे [3]गुणप्रकर्षप्रसाधितारामे ।
त्वयि मालति मथितायां जातमरण्यं गृहोपवनम् ।।

---

१. वर्त्तिष्यते । २. विदध्या । ३. ०प्रसादिता० ।

५४. दीपिका ।

त्वं दीपिके करगतापि कुदैवदोषा–
न्निर्वापिता बलवता मरुता निपत्य ।
तेनाहमन्ध इव पङ्गुरिव प्रभिन्न–
मर्मेव नीत इव हन्त बहिर्जगत्याः ॥

५५. दीपः ।

ध्वान्तं गाढमपाकृतं विरचिता विस्फूर्तिभाजो दृशः
क्लृप्तं सर्वपदार्थमण्डलमनायासोपलभ्यं पुनः ।
दीप स्नेहसमृद्ध संभृतगुण श्लाघ्यप्रकाश त्वया
किं किं नोपकृतं कृतं च सकलं शोभागृहं नो गृहम् ॥

५६. चन्द्रः ।

उन्मूलयतस्तापं मीलयतस्तिमिरसङ्घातम् ।
तव तात [1]कैरविण्यां हिमकर करकौशलं किमपि ॥

५७.

[2]लशुने कुसुमाधिवासनं [3]पिशुने सज्जनताप्रसञ्जनम् ।
शुनि किञ्च शुचित्वकल्पनं न विधेरप्यधिकारगोचरम्[4] ॥

५८. हारः ।

विश्वेषामसि भूषणं तिरयसि ज्योतिष्मतामद्भुत
सौभाग्यं विपुलीकरोषि परितः प्रज्ञावतामुत्सवम् ।
हंहो हार सुवृत्त सद्गुण समुद्वेलप्रभामण्डल
[5]प्रायेण स्पृहयन्ति के न भवते भाग्यप्रधाना जनाः ॥

---

१. कैरविन्यां । २. लसुने । ३. पिसुने । ४. गोचरः । ५. प्रायण ।

५९. बर्बुरः ।

न च्छाया तरुणार्कतीव्रकिरणक्लेशोपशान्तिक्षमा
न स्फीतानि फलानि नापि कुसुमं भृङ्गस्पृहाभाजनम् ।
[१]मूर्तिः केवलमुल्बणैरुपचिता कीलोपमैः कण्टकै-
र्बब्बूरद्रुम दारुमात्र भवतः को नाम भव्यो गुणः ॥

६०.

भवन्ति नोपभोगाय कुजातानां विभूतयः ।
तन्तुश्रेणी बिसस्येव क्षीरमर्कतरोरिव ॥

६१. शिलीन्ध्रः ।

न मूलदार्ढ्यं न गुणप्रकर्षो
न क्षेत्रशुद्धिर्न च बीजशुद्धिः ।
मुखानुषङ्गेण परं शिलीन्ध्रै-
र्महाजनानां पतनाय जातम् ॥

६२. निर्धनः।

परिमितमपि भारं वोढुमप्रौढिभाजः
शमयितुमुपतापं प्राणिनामक्षमस्य ।
अहह गुणविशेषालिङ्गितस्यापि नूनं
नभस इव [२]महत्त्वं [३]निष्फलं निर्धनस्य ॥

---

१. मूर्त्तिः । २. महत्वं । ३. निःफलं ।

६३. मुरली ।

क्षिप्तः शीलशिलोच्चयस्तृणमिव त्रुट्यद्गुणग्रन्थयः
क्लृप्ताः [१]कीर्तिपटाः कृतं मलिनिमग्रस्तं समस्तं कुलम् ।
आरुह्याधरपल्लवं व्रजपतेराभीरवामभ्रुवां
व्रीडाखण्डनपण्डिते मुरलिके नाद्यापि विश्राम्यसि ॥

६४. मेघः ।

एक एव जगतामसि खेदच्छेदहेतुरिति मेघ वदामः ।
कोऽयमस्य पतगस्य पिपासोश्चञ्चुमात्रपरिपूर्तिविलम्बः[२] ॥

६५. चक्रवाकः ।

कृत [३]सौहार्दसम्पन्नं रथाङ्गमिथुनं यदि ।
किमकारि विदग्धेन विधिना हन्त यामिनी ॥

६६. कामः ।

निर्व्यापारः सुरभिसमयः सम्प्रवृत्तो लतानां
लीलाच्छेदः प्रतिहतमदा षट्पदानां च [४]पङ्क्तिः ।
[५]जीर्णारण्यप्रतिममखिलं मण्डलं भूतधात्र्याः
केन प्रौढिं भजतु भगवान्पुष्पधन्वा मनोजः ॥

६७. भ्रमरः ।

अत्रामोदमरन्दयोर्न कणिका [६]कोषान्तरस्थायिनी
पत्रच्छत्रपरम्पराऽपि विफला रम्भा कियद्वर्ण्यताम् ।
एतत्सर्वमपूर्वशिल्पिरचनाचातुर्यमुच्चावचं
किं मोहादलिपुत्र चित्रकमले भूयः परिभ्राम्यसि ॥

---

१. कीर्त्ति । २. पूर्त्ति० ३. सौहार्द्र । ४. पङ्क्ति ।
५. जीर्णारण्यंप्रतिम० । ६. केषांतर० ।

६८. कल्पद्रुमः ।

प्राणेभ्योऽपि गरीयसीं गणयति ग्रामीणगोष्ठीमिव
श्रेणीमम्बुरुहां रसालमसुहृद्बुद्ध्या न पश्यत्यपि ।
त्वं कल्पद्रुम दुर्मिलः किल कृतः क्रूरेण धात्रा हठाद्
भृङ्गस्तुङ्गमना मनस्विषु महामानी कमालम्बताम् ॥

६९. मालती ।

हा हन्त मालतीनामामोदमशेषमादातुम् ।
कुसुमानि दारुयन्त्रे निधाय मुग्धः प्रपीडयति ॥

७०. भृङ्गः ।

[1]केतककुसुमामोदप्रणयी नयपण्डितो भृङ्गः ।
कण्टकभयं न गणयति न भवति विरसो रजःपुञ्जैः ॥

७१. बकः ।

वाग्देव्या सह सख्यमाचर वह ब्रह्माणमाविष्कुरु[2]
प्रावीण्यं गतिषु प्रदर्शय निजं विद्याबलं निर्मलम् ।
मीनं मा स्पृश मौक्तिकं कवलय क्रीड द्रुतं द्यौस्तले
चेदव्रीड बकाधम प्रतिभया हंसत्वमाकाङ्क्षसि ॥

---

१. केतकं ।   २. माविःकुरु ।

७२. सिंहः ।

येनाकारि विनिद्रमद्रिकुहरे मत्तद्विपानां कुलं
किञ्च [1]स्वैरमभाजि राजपदवी शश्वन्मृगश्रेणिषु ।
सिंहः सोऽपि शृगालजालकवलभ्रष्टं पलं विप्लवे
भाग्यानामनुवासरं विधिवशादन्वेषयन्वर्तते ॥

७३. पुरदेवता ।

पृच्छामः पुरदेवते भगवति भ्रान्तेन हन्त भ्रमा–
त्केनासि श्वपचाङ्गने विगलितश्रेयस्यभिस्थापिता ।
मूत्रैराकुलयन्ति यत्र परितः श्वानो गुदप्रोञ्छनै–
रुद्वेलाः किल दूषयन्ति शिशवो निन्दन्ति बाढं विटाः ॥

७४. पत्रच्छत्रम् ।

पान्थानामधिमारवाध्व तपति ग्रीष्मोष्मरूक्षे रवौ
रक्षायै रमणीयशिल्पिकलया विष्वग्वितानीयसे ।
वर्षत्यम्बुधरे तरस्विनि तथा विश्रामशालायसे
पत्रच्छत्र विचित्रवैभव सखे सर्वोत्तमं ते जनुः ॥

७५. अग्निः ।

अयि देव दहन मा दह [2]शरवणमनघं तृणभ्रान्त्या ।
यास्यति बत वैयर्थ्यं बाणासनसंग्रहो जगति ॥

---

१. स्वैरसभाजि. २. शरवन०।

७६. वंशः ।

त्वामादौ निगदन्ति निर्मलधियस्तुङ्गेषु तुङ्गं तथा
जन्मस्थानमुदाहरन्ति धनुषां विभ्राजमानत्विषाम् ।
गोविन्दाधरचुम्बिनी च मुरली मुख्यं तवैवाङ्गकं
हंहो वंश वनावतंस भवतः किं न प्रशंसास्पदम् ॥

७७. काण्डकारः ।

अत्रापेक्षितमञ्जनं जनमनोहारि प्रसन्नाः स्रजः
शृङ्गारानुगुणा गुणाः सुललितं सामोदमुद्वर्तनम् ।
भ्रातः काण्डकदम्बनिर्मितिपटो कीटादपि त्रस्यतां
[1]षण्ढानां नगरे निवेदय कया वित्ताशया [2]वर्तसे ॥

७८. कीरः ।

वचनं विशुद्धरचनं मरकतमाणिमञ्जुला [3]मूर्तिः ।
हा हन्त भवति हेतुस्तव कीर तवैव बन्धाय ॥

७९. बलीवर्दः ।

गर्ज [4]ग्राम्यगृहाङ्गणेषु विहर स्वैरं वने निर्जने
नद्याः कूलमकाण्डमुत्खन मुदा [5]वर्तस्व दुर्वृत्तिषु ।
गोष्ठाधिष्ठित गर्वसार सुरभिप्राणेश दुर्गे पथि
द्रष्टव्यः खलु पृष्ठलम्बिनि भरे भूयानयं ते मदः ॥

---

१. खंढानां । २. वर्त्तसे । ३. मूर्त्तिः । ४. गृहांगनेषु । ५. वर्त्तस्व ।

८०. सिंहः ।

निद्रात्येव न निद्रितोऽपि न खलु स्वास्थ्यं समालम्बते
नैभं नाम शृणोति गर्जितमथ श्रुत्वापि न क्रुध्यति ।
न स्थैर्यं वहति स्थितोऽपि न पुनः प्राणोचितं चेष्टते
सिंहः सम्भृतपौरुषोऽपि मशकैरुद्वेजितः सीदति ॥

८१. मशकः ।

कर्णौ कीलकसन्निभैर्नवनवैरुद्वेजयन्तं रवै–
राचामन्तमनुक्षणं तनुभृतां प्राणायितं [1]शोणितम् ।
यत्नेनापि गरीयसा न मशक त्रस्यन्तमस्त्राधिकं
त्वामत्यल्पकलेवरं कृतवता धात्रा जगद्रक्षितम् ॥

८२. करिणः ।

यात द्राग्विपिनं विगाह्य सरसीमालोड्य शीतोदका–
मास्वाद्य क्षितिभृत्तटीषु सरसं कण्डूतिकेलीसुखम् ।
रे रे कुञ्जरयूथपाः कररुहस्यूतेभमुक्तामणिः
शेते सम्प्रति शैलसद्मनि परिश्रान्तः सकान्तो हरिः ॥

८३. वायसः ।

[2]तृष्णार्तोऽपि सिताद्रवं न पिबति प्रायः [3]क्षुधार्तोऽपि स–
न्नैवाश्नाति समर्पितानि पुरतो मुक्ताफलानि क्वचित् ।
न्यस्तः काञ्चनपञ्जरे विगलितानन्दः परं ध्यायति
प्रेतक्षोणिमनुक्षणं शवगुदग्रासग्रही वायसः ॥

---

१. श्रोणितम् । २. तृष्णार्त्तो० । ३. क्षुधार्त्तो० ।

८४. दर्भः ।

त्वमङ्ग यज्ञाङ्गमासि त्वमेव
क्रियाधनानामनघः सहायः ।
तृणं पुनस्त्वामपि दर्भ देवो
वदन् विदग्धेषु बभूव वाच्यः ॥

८५. निम्बः ।

न त्वां चूतमिव श्रयन्ति सततं कीराः कृतश्रेणयः
सानन्दं न पिकाः पिबन्ति परितो माध्वीकसारं तव ।
नित्यं नागरनिष्ठुरोक्तिपटलीपात्र त्रिलोकीतले
निम्ब त्वं फलसम्पदा बलिभुजां भाग्यव्रजैरेधसे ॥

८६. इक्षुः ।

सुक्षेत्रं तव जन्मभूरिति पुनः पर्वानुबन्धादियं
मेध्या [1]मूर्तिरिति प्रभूतगारिमग्रामा न के के गुणाः ।
माधुर्यं परिपीडितोऽपि धरासि क्रान्तो गुरुग्रान्थिभिः
साङ्गं सज्जनचेष्टितं क भवता सम्प्राप्तमिक्षो वद ॥

८७. डुण्डुभः ।

अस्मद्गोत्रगरीयसा वसुमती विश्रब्धमङ्गे धृता
शम्भोः किञ्च कपर्दसीमनि सदा सन्दर्भसूत्रायितम् ।
लोकं नः समुपाश्रितो बलिरिति प्रोद्भूतपुंस्त्वभ्रमो
भेकानामधिगोष्ठि गर्जति मदालीढो मुहुर्डुण्डुभः ॥

---

१. मूर्त्ति० ।

८८. नकुलः ।

अमी जगति जिह्मगा इति पुनर्द्विजिह्वा इति
स्फुटं विषधरा इति प्रकृतिभीषणा भोगिनः ।
त्वया यदिह निर्दयं दशनकोटिभिश्चर्विता-
स्तदेतदुरुपाटवं नकुल [1]नूनमाविष्कृतम् ॥

८९. खञ्जनः ।

स्त्रीणां विलोचनविलासकलासु मुख्य-
माचार्यकं किमपि कौतुकिनस्तवैव ।
त्वं वीक्षितश्च खलु खञ्जन दिक्षु दिक्षु
विश्राणयस्यभिमतानि कियद्वदामः ॥

९०. चकोरः ।

चेदिन्दुमण्डलपरिच्युतया चकोर
कुक्षिम्भरिर्भवसि चान्द्रिकया चिराय ।
कस्मादभिज्ञपरिषत्परिचिन्तनीय-
मङ्गारचर्वणमखर्वमुरीकरोषि ॥

९१. श्वा ।

[2]दीर्णस्वतालुमूलस्रवदस्रकदम्बकलिपतोत्साहः ।
[3]श्वा विरसमस्थिखण्डं मोहेन पुनः पुनर्दशति ॥

---

१. माविःकृतम् । २. ०श्रवद० । ३. विश्वा ।

९२. मूर्खः ।

परिहासप्रवणतया चोरितमङ्गारमङ्गनासुहृदः ।
मूर्खः पलालपुञ्जे गोपायति गोपिताकारः ॥

९३. धत्तूरः ।

परं [1]परीक्षासमये महिम्नः फले दले वा कुसुमे न भेदः ।
अभिन्नरूपः सकलः समाजो धत्तूर धन्यस्य तवैव तावत् ॥

९४. लवङ्गलता ।

तृणं कमलिनीवनं विगणयन्ति चूताङ्कुरं
त्यजन्ति वृजिनं बुधा इव हसन्ति हृद्या लताः ।
न केतकतरौ मनस्तरलयन्ति तन्द्रालवो
लवङ्गलतिके न के मधुलिहस्त्वया मोहिताः ॥

९५. गोमयकीटः ।

अधिवनमरे विदध्यास्त्वं यदि खदिराङ्कुरेऽपि रतिम् ।
गोमयकीट कुटुम्बिनमलिनस्त्वां को न भाषेत ॥

९६.

धन्याः कथञ्चन मनःकथयापि कान्ते
दृक्प्रान्तलङ्घिनि दिनान्यतिवाहयन्ति ॥
प्राणेशपेशलपथप्रणयी कुलीना-
वर्गः कथं कलयतामुपतापशान्तिम् ॥

---
१. परिक्षा ।

९७. चन्द्रः ।

तारकारमण तारकाचयं चेदशेषमुदयन्विलुम्पसि ।
हन्त [1]भर्तुरुदयाभिशंसिनामाशया कथय कुत्र गम्यताम् ॥

९८. जम्बूकः ।

मदकुम्भिकदर्थनापटोरटवीं[2] केसरिणो विगाहसे ।
अपि वेत्सि न विश्वविश्रुतामररे जम्बूकजातिमात्मनः ॥

९९. नदी ।

किं तरङ्गिणि दुनोषि लज्जया
लङ्घ्यसे यदिह [3]जीर्णजम्बुकैः ।
दोष एष निखिलः पयोमुचा-
मञ्चितेन भवती कलङ्कभूः ॥

१००. समुद्रः ।

कस्त्वां विशेषलिप्सुर्लोकेषु जनः समाश्रयतु ।
क्षारीकरोषि गङ्गाजलमपि जलधे सुधास्वादु ॥

१०१. चमरीमृगः ।

अमुनैव निर्निमित्तं निरन्तरं सङ्कटे पतसि ।
किमनर्थमूलमङ्गे चमरीमृग चामरं वहसि ॥

---

१. भर्तुं० । २. पटोरटवी । ३. यंबुकैः ।

१०२. एरण्डः ।

त्वं शाखाशतसम्भृतोऽपि कुसुमैश्छन्नोऽपि नामभ्रमा–
देरण्ड व्यसनानुबन्धिषु मुधा वृक्षेषु मा गाः क्वचित् ।
तेऽन्ये शैलशिलासदृक्षवपुषो वृक्षाः सहन्ते सदा
ये वज्रादपि दारुणं करटिनां कण्डूयनोपद्रवम् ॥

१०३. सूर्यः ।

[1]लीनायां निशि कैरवेषु तिमिरे लब्धास्पदे कौशिक–
श्रेणीचक्षुषि चक्रवाकमिथुने विश्लेषबाधोज्झिते ।
सिन्दूरारुणराजमानबलभिद्वेतण्डगण्डोपमा–
पात्रं लोचनगोचरः समजनि प्राभातिको भास्करः ॥

१०४.

यत्किञ्चिदत्र मोहेन प्रबद्धमसमञ्जसम् ।
संख्यावद्भिरसंख्यातगुणैः कार्यं समञ्जसम् ॥

१. लीनाय ।

☆☆☆